

A
VINDICATION,
OR *Davies's*

Further confirmation of some other Scriptures, produced to prove the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, distorted and miserably wrested and abused
by Mr. *John Knowles*:

Together with a probation or demonstration of the destructiveness and damnableness of the contrary Doctrine maintained by the aforesaid Mr *Knowles*.

Also, the Doctrine of Christs satisfaction, and of reconciliation on Gods part to the creature, cleared up from Scripture, which of late hath been much impugned.

And a Discourse concerning the springing and spreading of error, and of the means of cure, and of the preservatives against it.

By *Samuel Eaton* Teacher of the Church of *Jesus Christ*,
commonly stiled the Church
at Duckenfield.

London, printed for *Henry Cripps* and *Lodowick Lloyd*, and are to be sold at their Shop in Popes-head-Alley, 1651.

- 2 -



To the Reader.

Reader,

Have in a former Treatise Vindicated certain Scriptures, which I produced against Mr. Knowles his absurd and destructive opinion against the Divinity of Christ, from such corrupt glosses which he did put upon them, in a Printed paper of his, Intituled, A friendly debate on a weighty sub-

A 3 ject,

ject, &c. And in my clearing of
Ioh. 8. 58. (which he had ex-
tremely darkned and falsified,
by the interpretation which he
put upon it) I encountred with
the many arguments and abu-
sive senses of Scripture which he
had made use of, and in which he
had placed the whole strength he
had, for the upholding of that
his heterodox and dangerous do-
ctrine, which he vented in Che-
ster, with too great success, to
the disturbing of the faith of ma-
ny: And whether I have not
razed his whole building to the
very

very ground, (which in three positions he set up & fortified) and whether I have not digged up the very foundation of it, & taken away every supporter of it; I leave it to the judicious, unprejudiced, and disengaged Readers to determine betwixt us.

Truth (after a little time of patient expectance) will prevale against, and triumph over error, because it hath the God of truth to engage for it, who can strengthen any weak contemptible instrument (whom he pleaseth to employ) to become mighty

ty in the defence of it.

My hope is, that enough hath already been represented to satisfie all ingenious dubious persons concerning the truth of Christ's Godhead, and therefore it is not absolutely needful to undertake the setting forth of another Treatise: But lest there should be any occasion of glorying administred to him, or others, Because I replied only to some part of his writing or Printed paper, and not to the whole; and lest he should comfort himself with conceits of the unanswerableness

ableness of that which is behind
of it, and is unreplyed to : and
lest the truth should suffer in
such Scriptures which remain
unexamined by me, by his wrest-
ing of them from their genuine
sense, and my not freeing of them
from such abuse ; I have under-
taken to carry on my reply unto
the remainder of his Book, that
nothing that is material therein
may be objected against me, as
pretermitted by me.

And because I did well un-
derstand that some would lie at
advantages, and would give it
out

out that Mr. Knowles his
book was never answered; if any
part be unanswered, and would
object against me, that I was not
able to defend all the Scriptures
and arguments produced by my
self, and impugned by him, but
did shamefully desert them, and
not rescue them from the force
of his battery which he made a-
gainst them: And because in the
vindicating of my arguments,
I foresaw that I should be neces-
sitated to discuss and discover
the weightiness of the point in
controversie, and that it is not

so

so light and trivial as some would
make it, but that it is of highest
concernment, and that all oppug-
ners of the Godhead of Christ
do oppugn mens salvation, and
that such an opinion that gain-
sayeth Christs Diety, is no lesse
then damnable; therefore I en-
gaged in my former Treatise to
compleat my reply, and therein
to attempt the giving satisfaction
in that point (which only to
mention was greatly offensive
to many precious Christians)
viz. that Faith in Christ consi-
dered as a meer creature, and
nothing

nothing more, is a false Faith,
and cannot save; it therefore
now concerned me (in point of
Truth) to finish the work which
I began; if God shall be plea-
sed to shine upon my Endeavors,
so far as to cast in any light to
dark souls thereby, that they
may be able (not only to discern
the falsehood of such a Doctrine,
but) to see into the horridness
thereof, I have my reward; how-
ever I lie down at Gods foot,
waiting upon him, to accomplish
his own glory in what way he
pleaseth, assuring myself that his
wisdom

wisdom and goodness is such,
that he will both find out time,
and means to undeceive poor
souls that belong to him, and will
deliver them out of the snare of
Satan, who captivates them
for a little space (while his
pleasure is) for their humbling;
and leaving this work in Gods
hand, and thyself also,

I remain thine
to serve thee in
the Lord,

Sa. Eaton.



A Vindication, or further confirmation
of some other Scriptures, produced to
prove the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, distort-
ed and miserably wrested and abused by
Mr *John Knowles*. &c.



He next Scripture that I pro-
duced for the confirmation
of the Diety of *Jesus Christ*,
(after Joh. 8.58.) was Rev. 1.
8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the*
beginning and the ending, saith
the Lord, which is, and which
was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

But he encounters with this Text, and would
evade the force of it, in these words : *How can*
you demonstrate (saith he) that these are the words
of Christ, and do relate to him ?

Repl. 1. I do demonstrate it from that agree-
ment which these words in the 8. verse have with
the words of the 11. and of the 17. verses, which
words of both places do refer to Christ, by his
own confession, and without the contradiction
of any, as the 13. and 17. verses do evidence to
the Reader, in which it appears to be Christ
that assumed the Titles of *Alpha and Omega*
to himself.

*2. I do collect it, because Christ is one of the
speakers*

speakers which we usually meet with in this Prophecy, but the Father is rarely or never found to be a speaker through this whole Book.

3. Because the things that are in this Book represented, are given by the Father unto Christ, but are shewed and signified by Christ unto his servants; now this is one thing that Christ shewed, which respected himself what he was, *I am* (saith he) *Alpha and Omega.*

4. Because there are no more speakers in this Chapter, but Christ and *John*, who can be made evidently to appear; therefore all that is spoken in it, must be referred to one of the two; but the 8. verse cannot be referred to *John*, therefore to Christ.

5. Because it concludes the proeme, and gives a period to the Preface, (as Pareys shews upon the place,) *John* had represented him coming in the clouds, in the 7. verse, and then in the words of the 8. verse, sets him before men, (for the consolation of the righteous, and terror of the wicked) as present, calling to them, *I am Alpha and Omega, &c.* who will make doubt of my coming? who can intercept it? *I am Alpha and Omega, &c.* But he imagines other Arguments will be made use of, to prove this place to refer to Christ, and disputes against them, his words are these:

You will peradventure say, that the thing is evident,

evident, in that he is called Lord, or you will bring the Testimony of learned Authors, who have interpreted the Words as spoken by Christ: And he confutes both these reasons, and saith, God, or the Father, distinct from Christ, is called Lord, Act. 3.19.20. &c. And Beza (saith he) conceived that these Words are spoken of God, absolutely taken. And Pareus confesseth certain Orthodox Interpreters do attribute the words to God absolutely considered.

Repl. The Title *Lord*, because it is rarely attributed to the Father in the New Testament, and when it is attributed to him, it is done with such clearness, that it is easily discerned, and because it is first commonly attributed to Christ, therefore it may be a ground of a probable Argument, that Christ is meant by it; but a necessary Argument cannot be deducted from it; therefore I wave it; and it had been wisdom if he had done so also, till he had discerned that I had made use of it as an Argument. As for learned Interpreters, though I honour them much, yet it hath not been my custom to bottom the sense that I put upon Scriptures upon them; but to prove it from the Scripture, either the Text it self or context, or some other parallel place; therefore he might have spared his labour in citing Authors, unless I had provoked him thereto.

B . .

But

But if he will produce Authors, why will he offer wrong to the Authors whom he produceth ? and make them speak that which they speak not ? that hath been the way to uphold a rotten tenent, and he treads in that way. I cannot find the words he cites in *Berz*, and he mentions not the place ; and if he can shew them in *Berz*, I can shew that *Berz* contradicts himself. If *Berz* have so expressed himself, probably he would do it when he came to give the sense of the place, but there his words are these : *Christus hic loquitur ut eternus Deus, ac si diceret, ego is sum ante quem nihil est, immo per quem factum est quicquid factum est, quicque ut annia intereant, superstes illis omnibus maneam, &c.* That is, Christ here speaks as the eternal God, as if he should say , I am he before whom there is nothing , yea and by whom every thing is made that is made , and am one who do abide, and am surviving when all other things perish. As for *Parens*, I confess he cites his words aright, and yet abuseth him egregiously ; for though he grants that some Orthodox Writers do apply these words to God, absolutely considered, yet he doth not grant that they are Orthodox in their Interpretation of that Text, but disputes against them, and renders reasons why the words must be applied to Christ. And in the very

very place from whence he fetcheth those words of Pareus, which he mentions in his Margin, these words immediately follow, *causas tamen evidentes sententia huic obstat, prius ostendi*, that is, though some Orthodox Interpreters do apply these words to God absolutely taken, or to the Trinity, yet I have before shewed manifest reasons which do cross this Opinion of theirs. Now he mentions the former words of this Author, and silenceth these latter words, and so deals unkindly and uncandidly with him.

But he saith, *We must betake our selves to reason, whereby the Spirit may convince us, of whom the Text in controversies is to be understood.*

Repl. This is new Doctrine that is here taught us, viz. that reason is the Spirits organ or instrument in its convictions that it sets upon men; and it is dangerous desperate Doctrine, which hath been exploded by all humble sober Christians; if a man must be believe no further then he can see, the whole Gospel must be rejected; for it is an high mystery which reason cannot look into, and the love of the Father and of Christ hath an height and depth, &c. which passeth knowledge: must not persons believe it? I have heard it, and do believe it, that the Spirit is sent to convince according to the revelation of Scripture, whether we can reach it with our reason,

reason, or cannot reach it ; but reason is now advanced as the only medium to Faith , which was formerly cryed down as the great Enemy of Faith.

But let his reasons be considered of.

1. This Text (saith he) declares the principal Author of those things which John the Divine Was to communicate to the seven Churches ; for these words begin a new matter, and are no part of the salutation : They speak of God even the Father, who is of highest authority , and from whom originally this Revelation was. Christ he is spoken of ver. 11. and is to be considered as the principal instrument , in conveying this Revelation to the Churches, for God gave it to him, to shew to his servants those things which were shortly to come to pass. ver. 1.

Rep. 1. This reason asserts several things, and proves nothing , and so leaves the Reader altogether unsatisfied, unless bare words must pass for currant.

2. There is no truth in any thing that he asserts in relation to this text in controversie ; for though there might be some colour for such a collection, that God the Father is the principal Authour of this Revelation , and Christ the principal Instrument of conveying this Revelation to the Churches, (which is only in a sense true, not of whole Christ, but of one part of him, to be

be understood) in relation to the first verse ; because there it is said that God gave it to Christ ; yet in relation to verse 8. of which the dispute is, there is not the le^{ast} shadow of ground for any one to conceive, much less to utter such things : For if *Alpha* signify the first, or the beginning, yet it must not be restrained to this Revelation, but must be extended to all things ; and whether the Father or Christ be meant, yet a person that is from everlasting to everlasting, and that is the root and fountain of all things, and that comprehends all things, is meant, as all the letters in the *Greek Alphabet* are comprehended betwixt *Alpha* and *Omega*.

3. It is unreasonable for him, or any one, to apply the letter *Alpha* to the Father in verse 8. and thence to deduce this conclusion, *the Father is of highest authority, and from him originally this Revelation was*, and then to apply the same letter *Alpha* in verse 11. to Christ, and thence to deduce a diverse, if not contrary, yea contradictory conclusion, viz. *Christ is the principal instrument in conveying this Revelation to the Churches* : For if Christ be but the principal instrument in conveying it, then he is not of highest authority, nor from him originally was this Revelation. Now it is sensless and notoriously absurd, to imagine that contrary conclusions should proceed from the same premises ; for na reference to the Father,

ther, he argues thus from verse 8, *The Father is Alpha, therefore he is of highest authority, and the original of this Revelation :* But in reference to Christ he argues thus from verse 11. *Christ is Alpha, therefore he is not of highest authority, nor the original of this Revelation, but the principal instrument only in conveying this Revelation to the Churches.* Would one think that rational persons should be taken with such kind of foolish and repugnant arguing which crosseth it self ?

4. In reference to verse 1. which is the text that seems most to countenance his assertions, there is much unsoundness in his collections; for either it must be thus understood, that though God the Father gave this Revelation to Christ, yet God the Father gave it not to Christ as an instrument simply considered ; but unto Christ who was his fellow ; for it is said of Christ, *That he shewed it to his servants, and signified it by his Angel to his servant John,* So that Christ is set forth here in his dominion and Lordship, equall with the Father over the creatures ; for more could not have been said of the Father in reference to the creatures, than *his servants, his Angel, his servant John;* or else if Christ be an Instrument, and that God gave this Revelation to him as an Instrument, yet this God is God the Father, Son and Spirit that gave it to him ; for the word God must be taken essentially, not personally ;

sonally ; and if Father had been named, as it is not, for it is said God gave unto him, yet not of the Father exclusively and dividedly from the Son and Spirit must it be understood, that he gave this Revelation to Christ : Nor of whole Christ is it to be understood neither , but of Christ according to his humane nature considered, and so God, *viz.* Father, Son and Spirit gave this Revelation to Christ, *viz.* to the Man Christ, or Christ considered in his Man-hood; and so Christ though in one respect he be an Instrument, yet in another respect he is the principal Authour, and original cause with the Father.

5. Neither is there any new matter begun in this 8. verse, as he affirms ; for if it be begun in it, it is also ended in it ; for in the 9. verse there is a change of the person speaking ; but it is the conclusion of the Exordium, or Preface ; Christ was described to come in the clouds, and what an one he is that shall come in the clouds, Christ himself giving witness to what *John* asserted, declares who he is; *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord Christ,* who will come in the clouds ; for either this 8. verse must have relation to verse 7. or else it is independent, and hath relation to nothing.

But let the second Reason be looked into and proved, whether there be any more strength in it.

2. Because (saith he) those titles are no where in the Scripture attributed to Jesus Christ; he is indeed called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, verse 11. but not Alpha and Omega as signifying the beginning and the end.

Rep. There is a great deal of untruth in this assertion, and much weakness, unworthy of one that pretends to instruct others, and to be a guide unto them in a way which they have not known.

1. There is untruth, for these titles are attributed in Scripture to Jesus Christ, he is not onely called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last; but he is called Alpha and Omega, as signifying the beginning and the ending, in Revel. 22. 13. the words are these, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* Where we may observe, 1. The person speaking, which is Christ, as may appear from verse 12. compared with verse 28. In verse 12. we have these words, *behold I come quickly;* and there is no change of the person in ver. 13. but the same (I) saith, *I am Alpha and Omega;* but what person is it? the Father or Christ? he in his third Reason saith it is the Father: But first, the Scripture speaks not of the Fathers coming, (unless in the Son, in Christ) to give rewards, but of Christs coming only; in 1 Thes. 1. 9. 10. *They turned from Idols to serve the living God,* and

to wait for his Son from heaven, and *Acts* 3. 20. he shall send Jesus, viz. the Father shall send him, but of the Fathers coming Scripture speaks nothing. 2. The Apostle John himself ends the controversie betwixt us, verse 20. where first we have the same words spoken, viz. *surely I come quickly.* 2. We have the sense of them in reference to the person speaking them, in the Apostle John's wish, and desire, *Amen,* (saith he) *come Lord Jesus;* he understood the person that spake those words to be Christ, and not the Father. 3. Christ himself clears it, that it was he that spake those words, *I am Alpha and Omega,* verse 16. *I Jesus* (saith Christ) *have sent mine Angel:* weigh the verses together, from verse 13. to verse 16. and see whether there be any change of person, but the same person, that said *I am Alpha and Omega,* said, *I Jesus have sent my Angel:* so that it is manifest that with a great deal of boldness he falsifies the truth, in saying that *Alpha and Omega*, as signifying the beginning and the end, is no where in Scripture attributed to Christ.

2. There is weakness in this Assertion of his, unworthy of a Teacher in *Israel.* (1.) Because *Alpha* and *Omega* as signifying *first and last*, are equivalent to *Alpha & Omega* as signifying *beginning and end*; for that whis is *first* is of it self, and hath no cause, and is eternal, and without beginning, and is the beginning of other things;

things ; and this the very Heathens from the light of Reason within them will confess : and that which is last must needs be the end. (2.) Because first and last (which he grants to be attributed to Christ) are Attributes of the most high God, as he is distinguished frō the creature ; See *Isai.41.4.* and *48.12.* but especially *44.6.* The words are, *I am the first and the last, and besides me there is no God.* Here the most high God (his design being to declare himself to be the most high God) doth assume this title first & last, as proper to him who is God alone, and there is none besides him. (3.) Because the true English of *Alpha* and *Omega* (being Greek letters) is *first and last, beginning and end,* for *Alpha* is the first, and the beginning of the letters, and *Omega* is the last, and the end of the letters ; and these two letters do equally signify beginning and end, as first and last ; therefore we find these letters sometimes interpreted beginning and end, *Rev.1.8.* which is the Text in controversie : sometimes first and last as *ver.11.* sometimes beginning and end, and first and last, *Rev. 22.13.* therefore his attempting to make a difference betwixt *Alpha* and *Omega*, as signifying beginning and end, and as signifying first and last, is very frivolous and senseless.

I shall now examine his third Reason, and see whether that will speed any better.

3. *Because (saith he) the terms in the Text are*

are elsewhere apparently and professedly given to God the Father, distinct from the Son; he is called Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end Rev. 21. 5. 6. And he that sate upon the Throne said, I am Alpha and Omega: The Angel useth the same phrase; Rev. 22. 13. and doubtless in the same manner.

Repl. Suppose it should be granted, that these terms *Alpha* and *Omega* be given to God the Father distinct from the Son, Rev. 21. 6. yet they are not attributed to the Father, Rev. 23. 13. but to the Son, as hath been evidently proved already; and it is not his (*doubtless the same phrase* Rev. 22. 13. *is used in the same manner*) that will carry it against such uncontroulable reasons that have been brought for it, viz. that Christ distinct from the Father, is called *Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and the end.

And hence I would draw an Argument.

If these termes, *Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and the end, be professedly given to the Father distinct from the Son Rev. 21. 5. 6. and the same termes be given to the Son, distinct from the Father, Rev. 22. 13. then the Father and the Son are one and the same God, and distinct only in their personality; for he confesseth himself that these termes, *Alpha* and *Omega*, as signifying beginning & end, are proper to the most high God, and denies that they are given to Christ: if then they be given to both the Father and to Christ,

Christ, then it will follow that the Father and Christ are this high God, and this is the consequence of his own premises. Oh that he might once come to see the sadness of his state, to be left to such blindnes and darkness, as not to be able to see, or else to such pertinacie and obstinacie of spirit, that he will not see when such clear palpable (not one but many) texts are before him, which have the truth of the coeternity, coessentiality and coequality of Christ, with the Father written & engraven upon them, which every ingenuous Reader must & will acknowledge. Truly, if there were no more Texts, nor Arguments for Christs Diety, but these which do denominate Christ to be *Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end*: And the Arguments which may be drawn from these, they may be able, being throughly weighed, to convince any person that is rational, and acknowledgeth the Scriptures, that Christ is the most high God, unless God have shut him up under that curse of *Isaiah*, viz. *Seeing they shall see and not understand, and hearing they shall bear and not perceive, &c.*

That which he speaks of these words, viz. *He that is, he which was, and he which is to come*, as referring to the Father in vers. 4. of this first Chapter is true, but impugneth not our Position, viz. That the same words in vers. 8. of the same Chapter

Chapter are referred to Christ, who is elsewhere called Jehovah frequently ; the proper signification of which word is, *He which is, he which was, and he which is to come.*

Having vindicated this Scripture of Rev. I. 8. The next which follows is to be considered of, which is, Joh. I. 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word Was God.*

That which he clouds the simplicity of this Text (which gives such full witness to Christs eternal Diety) with, is another Translation, or Reading which he frames, and puts upon the Text, which is this,

In the beginning Was the Word, and the Word Was with the God, and the Word Was a God; And he puts this sense upon them, In the beginning (in the first part of time) Was the Word, (Jesus Christ) according to the Spirit of holiness (and he means the soul of Christ did exist) And the Word was with the God (this Jesus Christ was a delight to the most high God, and did converse with him;) And the Word was a God, (this Jesus Christ had power committed to him, whereby he might represent the most high God. This Translarion he fetcheth from the omission of the Article ; Christ is called God without the Article ; put therto, but the Article is annexed to God, referring to the Father ; and then he puts his

his Gloss upon it, in a strange exposition of the words.

Rep. I grant his Observation to be true, that in this place of *John*, where (God) refers to the Father, there is an Article affixed; but where God refers to Christ, there the Article is not affixed. But is this a ground of such a Translation or Version which he hath framed? is ὁ Θεός, God, with an Article to be taken evermore for the most high God? and is θεός, God, without an Article to be taken evermore for one that represents the most high God, but is not the most high God? If this be so, then Christ is the most high God, for he is called ὁ Θεός, God, with an article in *Heb. 1.7.* which is fetched from *Psa. 45.6.* which he hath so much disputed against, endeavouring to prove Christ in that place to be but a creature God, in the former part of his answer, which I in my former Treatise of Reply have vindicated against him. And the Father, (whom he hath stood for, to the derogation of the other two persons, endeavouring to prove him to be the only high God) is not the high God at all; for in *Heb. 1. 6.* he is spoken of as God without an Article, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, that is Christ, it is θεός; and not τὸ θεόν, it is without an Article: Do but observe how God leaves him to confound himself, because though he have parts, yet he abuseth them, and

and God takes the wise in their own craftiness.

And it is to be observed, that Christ is called God with an Article annexed to it, in the same verse where the Father is spoken of as his God, and with an Article also, *Heb. i. 9*, which (according to his collection) makes both the Father and Christ to be the God, that is, the most high God, and so to be coessential, because there cannot be the most high God, but one most high God. Thus Christ is justified in his Diety by himself against his will.

Quest. But the Question may be moved, Why is the Article affixed to God when the Father is spoken of, and not affixed to God when Christ is spoken of?

Answ. There is great reason for it in this place of *John*; for if it were not so, the persons of the Father and of Christ would be confounded; for the words run thus; *καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, And the Word was With God, and the Word Was God; had there been an Article prefixed to θεός, God, had it been ὁ θεός, in ὁ λόγος, it must have been translated, and God was the Word, and not the Word was God, and then God & the Word would have been confounded, viz. God the Father of whom it is spoken that Christ was with him, would have been confounded with Christ, for God, with the Article affixed would

would have been (in right translation) *the subject*, and *the Word* would have been *the predicate*, and then it must have been rendred, *God was the Word*, and not *the Word was God*, as it now runs, according to the intention of the Holy Ghost, whose design is by omission of the Article to manifest forth the distinction of the persons of the Father and Son in unity of Essence ; both are God, yet the one is not the other.

The like omission of the Article we may observe in Job. 4. 24. The words in Greek are πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, and it is translated, and truly (because the article τὸ is left out before πνεῦμα) *God is a Spirit* ; whereas had the Article been affixed, it had altered the Translation, and it must have been thus rendred, *the Spirit is God*, or *a Spirit is God*, and so the sense would be changed; other instances there might be were they needful. And this he might have observed from Beza, had he been willing to have had his eyes opened.

As for the Gloss that he makes upon the words, I confuted it formerly in part, and have shewed in my other Treatise, that by beginning the first part of time is meant, and that the Verb or Particle (*was*) shews a preexistence before the beginning, or before time was, and not that Christ had his first exisitence then when the beginning was ; for the heavens and the earth had their exisitence then when time first was in the beginning of

of it, and subsisted together with it, as Moses records it ; but the Word was before it, and so was eternal, for nothing was before the beginning but eternity. And whereas he makes this to be the sense of these words, *The Word was With God* ; *This Jesus Christ was a delight to the most high God, and did converse with him* ; restraining high God to the Father, and excluding Christ, it is but the venting of his own conceit in stead of Truth ; for God there is taken personally, and not essentially, as I have shewed before often-times ; and the meaning is, the person of the Son was with the person of the Father from all eternity, and was a delight before the world was founded, as from Pro. 8. appears, *He was as one brought up with the Father from everlasting, and was daily his delight.* But the sense that he puts upon the last words (*viz. and the Word was a God*) is the most gross of all, and palpably corrupt, *viz. This Jesus Christ had power committed to him, whereby he might represent the most High God :* And the reason which he renders doth not make it more tollerable, *viz. the name God is common to God and creatures:* for I have shewed, that never any single person was called God absolutely without limitation and restriction. And in this place it is said, that Christ was God from the first, that he was, and he was when the beginning was ; and it is not said that he began to

be when the beginning was, therefore he was before, and consequently he was God before ; and it will follow that he was God from eternity, and not in regard of any power committed to him, whereby he might represent the most high God ; for there was neither heaven nor earth when he was God, over whom to exercise any power, nor any creature to whom to represent God. And I have shewed that power which he had, was power in himself (as life was in himself) and was not, neither could be power committed to him, power in him being such as no creature was capable of, by which he at first created, and doth yet uphold the world, *Heb. i. 3.*

And whereas he gives reasons from this text, why Christ should not be the most high God, viz. *Because he is distinguished from God, and God cannot be distinguished from himself,* he himself answers it by the mention which he makes of personality, Christ is distinguished from God taken personally, viz. for the Father, from the person of the Father is Christ distinguished, but not from God essentially taken, nor from the essence of the Father, for so he and his Father are one. But he takes not upon him to answer us in this distinction, and to overthrow it, though he knows that our great strength lies in it, but instead of answering, chargeth us to say that which

which we say not, *viz.* that we call the Father God by way of eminency, and disputes against this, as inconsistent to that coequality which we hold, and shelters himself under it. But he wrongs us, for we say the Son is called God as distinct from the Father, but not by way of eminency, they cannot both be eminent one above the other, and yet coequal. That which follows of *The God and A God* which he flies to, as a reason why Christ is not the most high God, I have answered before, and need say no more of it.

After *John 1. 1. Mat. 28. 20.* was produced by me to prove the God head of Christ, are these, *Lo I am with you alwaies unto the end of the world,* to which text he answers thus.

The meaning of the phrase, *I am with you, &c.* is no more then this, *I will do you good, Whilst ye remain employed in my work:* And he brings Jacob as the author of the interpretation; *Old Jacob (saith he) no bad interpreter, is my Authour,* Gen. 31. 3. compared with Chap. 32. 9. in the one place God promiseth to be with him, in the other place Jacob expounds it to be Gods dealing well with him.

Rep. This metaphorical presence, in actions of grace and favours, (which he would have to be the sole meaning of the words, *I will be with thee*) doth not exclude the essential presence, but doth rather include it; for how is Christ a-

ble to do all good to his Apostles and Disciples in all places of the world, and in all conditions and necessities, in which they might be, and at all times, and yet not be essentially present with them? If he can declare it, let him declare it; In the mean time that parallel place, (which he cites from Gen. 31. 3. compared with chap. 32. 9.) is against him, for God is unable to do good to all, (and so to Jacob) by his essential presence with all, and in all, and so with Jacob, and in Jacob. And though God have all the Angels to wait upon him, and all the creatures at his command to go for him, and to do for him what he appoints, yet if he were not essentially present himself with all, and in all, he could not supply all with all good that they want; for he could not see all and know all, if he were not present in all, if he did not fill all, and if all did not live and move and had not being in him. Therefore the Lord argues in Jer. 23.24. from his filling all, to his knowing all, the words are these, *Can any hide himself in secret places, that I shall not see him?* do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord? and if this be so of God, that he works all by his presence with all, then it is so of Christ also; and the words *I will be with you*, though they may extend to actions of love and kindness, and may comprise well dealing and doing good within them, yet they do properly hold out the way

way and means in which Christ will be helpful to them, he is with them alwaies to take notice of their condition, and to apply himself thereto, and Christ doth assure them, that though he shall be bodily absent from them, and in heaven, yet in the eternal Spirit, in the divine nature, he is alwaies present with them : In which sense (he saith) that he the Son of man (though upon earth in his flesh) was yet according to his diety in heaven, *John 3. 13. and chap. 17. 24.*

But he goes on, and saith, *Jesus Christ is present with his Messengers, and deals well with them, when he doth instruct, comfort, strengthen and protect them ; and all these he doth in his absence by his Spirit, whom the Father hath sent in his name.* *John 14. 26.* And he instanceth in instruction, and saith, *Christ instructed his Apostles, but not immediately; for the Spirit (saith he) that came in Christ's name, and received of his, was the instrument by which Jesus Christ did work :* And he cites *John 16. 13, 14. 15.* for it.

Rep. I have shewed already that these operations of grace do not hinder the essential presence of Christ, according to his Godhead, with the Apostles, but do rather imply it ; but he excludes it, and saith he doth all these things in his absence by his Spirit. Now though there be a truth in it, that Christ being in heaven in flesh, and absent from earth, so far as respects the flesh,

doth effect all things by the Spirit, yet it is not onely false, but foolish in the sense that he intendeth it, and in the words that he expresseth it in.

I. I shall readily grant it in a sense, that Christ works all by the Spirit, and that there is an order of working among the persons in the Godhead; and in this order the Father works by the Son, and by the Spirit; and the Son works from the Father and by the Spirit; and the Spirit works from the Father and from the Son, by himself; and the Father is the person sending both the Son and the Spirit; and the Son is the person sent from the Father, and sending the Spirit with the Father; and the Spirit is the person sent both from the Father and from the Son; but it will not follow that therefore Christ (though bodily absent) is personally absent from his Messengers, and instructs them not immediately by himself, but onely by the Spirit: For as it is said in *John 5. 17.* by Christ of the Father, *My Father worketh hitherto and I Work:* The Father worketh all things by the Son; he made the world by the Son; and he judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son; that is, by the Son he judgeth and manageth all things, and not without him; yet he worketh, that cannot be denied, though by the Son; yea the very works that the Son worketh, and all of them and none other but them, the Father worketh;

worketh; the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, and the Father and the Son are one in essence, though two in personality, and the Father and the Son work one thing ; the Father by the Son, and the Son from the Father, and the Son can do nothing of himself apart from the Father, nor the Father any thing apart from the Son, but by him, as I have shewed at large in my former Treatise ; so it may be said of the Son and of the holy Ghost, that the Son worketh hitherto, and the holy Ghost worketh ; that is, they work the same work, the Son by the holy Ghost, and the holy Ghost from the Son ; and the holy Ghost shall not speak of himself, nor act of himself (as saith the Scripture which he cites) that is, he shall not speak or work any thing apart from the Son, but what he shall hear and see, that shall he speak and do ; and the Son doth speak and act by him the same things, and nothing else ; for the Son is in the holy Ghost, and the holy Ghost in the Son, and they are one in essence, and therefore cannot be divided in operation, but work the same things in such an order of working, and to this the Scripture gives witness in *2 Cor. 3. 17.* The Lord is called the Spirit, and the Spirit is called the Spirit of the Lord Christ ; how can this be ? Essentially the Lord Christ is the Spirit, they are one : Personally considered, the Spirit is the Spirit of the

Lord Christ, and the Lord Christ is not the Spirit : And Rev. 2. 1. to 6. compared with verse 7. In verse 1. to 6. Christ is the person that speaks to the Church, and so to all the Churches, and commands *John* to write ; but in verse 7. it is said, *he that hath an ear to hear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches* ; so that Christ speaks, and yet the Spirit speaks, and Christ and the Spirit are one in essence, though two in persons; and Christ spake to the Churches by the Spirit, and the Spirit spake from Christ. But they act and work together the same things, and none other ; as the Father and the Son do, so do the Son and Spirit, and indeed Father and Son and Spirit are one in essence, and one in operation, the order of working onely excepted, *I John 5.7.* so that Christs instructing by the Spirit, obstructs not Christs personal presence with the Disciples here upon earth, though his body be in heaven. And the sending of the Spirit both by the Father and by the Son, are acts of counsel among the persons in the Godhead, as hath been fully declared in reference to Christ, who was sent of the Father, and yet gave himself. And the Spirit though sent, when he cometh acteth not meerly as one sent, according to the will of another, but as himself willeth, *I Cor. 12. 11.* so that his sending was by counsel with his own consent.

2. In the sense that he asserts it, that Christ in Heaven acts by his Spirit, I shall utterly deny it, as that which both wants truth in it, and is absurd ; as that which is neither consistent with Scripture nor reason, nor congruous to his own Opinion : for he takes away Christs immensity, and ubiquity, and puts it upon the Spirit, to prevent Christs being in Heaven and on Earth at once , and his filling of Heaven and Earth with his presence, that he might not thereby be acknowledged God, and yet he makes the Spirit to be universally present , and so makes him more then a creature , wherein he contradic~~s~~ts himself, for his words are these, *Christ doth all these works in his absence by his Spirit* ; therefore the Spirit is present, for he supplies the defect of Christs presence , and yet withall he saith, *The spirit which received of Christs was Christs instrument by which Jesus Christ did the work* : Therefore he is not God, for God cannot be an instrument, therefore he is but a creature; wherein he crosseth himself. So then what must not be yielded to in Christ, least he shoulde be God, he yields to the Spirit whom he makes not God, but a creature. And in this he not only sets Christ below the Father , whom he acknowledgeth to be God , but he sets him below the Spirit, whom he acknowledgeth but a creature, and now Christ is neither God, nor yet the first and

and chief of the creatures, for the Spirit is more excellent then he , for the Spirit can be present with all the Apostles in all the parts and Climats of the World at one time, to instruct them, comfort them, &c. and Christ is shut up in Heaven and cannot. And this is contradictory to himself, for he makes Christ the first of the creatures, and the Maker of the rest, and the Lord of them , and he makes him a Spirit in his first existence, and yet the Spirit that was made by him can be with all the Apostles, and Disciples, and Saints also, and abide with them for ever, and administer to them all good, but Christ who is his Lord and Maker cannot. O monstrous and senseless Opinion, wherein God leaves him to be confounded !

But how contradictory to reason is this, that the Spirit should be the instrument of Christ, and so a creature inferiour to Christ, and yet be present in all places in Heaven, in Earth, in the Sea, and every where, for where ever Saints be, there the Spirit is, & Saints are in all these places, *The Spirit is one that bears Witness in Heaven, 1 Job.5.7.* Therefore there he is, and he bears witness on Earth in the hearts of Believers, in *Rom.8. 16.* and therefore there he is. And the whole Spirit dwels in every Saint , for we do not read of any parts of the Spirit , into which he is divided , and if Saints be every where,

where, the whole Spirit is every where, and such a boundless Essence is not competent to any creature; it is that which God himself arrogates as proper to him, *do not I fill Heaven and Earth?* *Jer. 23. 24.* whole God fills every place, and the whole Spirit fills every Saint. As bodies have their *loca*, their places; so Spirits, all created ones, have their *ubi*, their some where, out of which and beyond which they are not; they are confined, if they be not circumscribed; but of the Spirit it is said, *whither shall I go from thy Spirit, the Spirit is everywhere.*

It is also extreamly repugnant to Scripture, that the Spirit should be Christs instrument, and consequently a creature, and it is as gross as the denying of the Diety of Christ, and his Heresie is multiplyed in this Assertion.

1. An Instrument acts and works after the will of the principal efficient, but the Spirit after his own will as himself pleaseth, and therefore no instrument.

2. The person by whom Christ wrought Miracles, was no instrument, but Christ according to his humane nature wrought Miracles by the vertue and power of the Spirit, therefore he was no instrument, *Mat. 12. 28. Acts 10. 38.*

3. He that was the uncure, with which Christ was annoyned and became more excellent and glorious then all his fellows; he that was the
en-

enrichment of Christ as man, as a creature, above all creatures, that exalted him in eminency above all Angels, &c. was not any instrument inferiour to Christ, but superiour to him as a creature, but the Spirit was the uncture wherewith Christ was annoyned, *Act. 10. 38.* and he received not the Spirit by measure as others did, but beyond all measure, *Job. 3. 34.* whence he came to excell all his fellows, *Heb. 1. 9.*

4. He that is the Spirit of God, and is to God as the spirit of a man is to man, he that alone knoweth the deep things of God and searcheth them; that is, hath deep full perfect knowledge of them, he cannot be an instrument to Christ, to take what Christ a creature, (as he makes Christ to be) shews him, and no more, and to shew them to men, but the Spirit is the Spirit of God, and stands to God as the Spirit of a man stands to man; and searcheth the deep things of God, therefore cannot be an instrument to take from Christ, and bring and shew to men. And it is contrary to Scripture to make the Spirit a creature, as if he be a creatures instrument (as he would make him) he must needs be.

1. He is called God by the Apostles of Christ, therefore he is God, *Act. 5. 3, 4.* compared together, prove it: in the 3. ver. Peter saith to *Ananias*, *Thou hast lyed to the holy Ghost;* in the 4. vers. he saith, *Thou hast lyed to God:*

He

He makes the holy Ghost to be God, for he shews the person against whom the sin was committed, it was not man, it was not any creature; it did rise higher, it was the holy Ghost, he was God. So that the holy Ghost and God are one and the same thing. And *I Cor. 3. 16.* Paul makes him God, in these words, *Know ye not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* This latter is the proof of the former, because the Spirit of God dwells in you, therefore saith the Apostle, *you are the temple of God*; here is no mention of Gods dwelling in them, but of the Spirits dwelling in them; if therefore the Spirit were not God, the Argument of the Apostle were nought. And by the Evangelist *Luke* in *Aet. 10. 3. 19, 20.* compared together, he is called God: in vers. 3. it is said, *The Angel of God came in to Cornelius, and commanded him to send men for Peter,* in vers. 19. 20. it is said, *That the Spirit told Peter that he had sent those men to him,* and therefore he must go with them. The men were sent upon the command of the Spirit, therefore the Spirit was that God that sent the Angel, and to be the Angel of the Spirit, and the Angel of God is all one.

2. He is called the God of *Israel*, *2 Sam. 23. 2, 3.* compared together do confirm it: in vers. 2. it is said, *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his*

his word was in my mouth ; in vers 3. it is said, *The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me* ; he that in vers. 2. is called the *Spirit of the Lord* ; in vers. 3. is called the *God of Israel* ; for one and the same person spake to *David*, not two persons spake to him, but one. And in *Luk. i. 68. 70.* compared together, and both of them compared with *2 Pet. i. 21.* in vers. 63. *Zachary blessed the Lord God of Israel Who visited and redeemed his people, &c.* in vers. 70. *Zachary makes this Lord God of Israel to be the person that spake by the mouth of the Prophets*, but who is he that spake by the mouth of the Prophets ? the Spirit is he ; Peter tells us so much, (and in many other places we read so much,) *2 Pet. i. 21. Holy men spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost.* Therefore if he inspired the Prophets, and spake in them and by them, he is the *Lord God of Israel*.

3. He is called the most High, *Luk. i. 35.* The Angel speaks thus to *Mary*, *The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee* ; This latter is but an enlargement of the former, the same person is spoken of in both propositions, with this difference only ; the name of the person spoken of, is put upon him in the former proposition, *viz* the *holy Ghost* ; the Title of the person is given to him in the latter; the *Highest with his power shall over-*

over-shadow thee, so that the holy Ghost is the highest. But some may object against this, and say, that the holy Ghost is not called the highest, but he is called the power of the Highest, or the virtue of the Highest, because the Highest by the virtue of the holy Ghost would form Christ in the womb of the Virgin, or would cause her to conceive, & so the holy Ghost and power are one thing, but not the holy Ghost and the Highest: If this were true, yet seeing a person is spoken of and not a thing, and this person is called the virtue or power of the Highest in so miraculous a work, he cannot be inferiour to the Highest; for he by whose force, and power, and virtue the highest shews himself to be the Highest, works as the Highest, must needs be as high as he, and if the Father should be the Highest in this place, yet the holy Ghost is made equal to him, which shews the Father and the holy Ghost to be one in Essence, though two in personality, because there can be but one Highest.

But it appears to be otherwise, that Spirit and power are not confounded, but distinguished, and there distinguished where God is mentioned in *Rom. 15.18,19.* *God made the Gentiles obedient to the Gospel, through mighty signs and Wonders done by the power of the Spirit of God;* here is power, and Spirit, and God, and all distinguished from

from other ; by God, the Father is meant ; by Spirit, the holy Ghost is meant ; and by power, the vertue, might, and efficacy of the holy Ghost is meant ; and it appears (which alone is sufficient to prove holy Ghost to be God) that mighty signs and wonders were done by the proper power of the holy Ghost ; it is not said that they were done by the power of God, *viz.* the Father, but by the power of the Spirit of God, by the Spirits own proper power.

4. He is called God most high, and Almighty, all these titles are put upon the Spirit in *Numb.* 24. 2. 16. compared together : In *verse 2.* it is said of *Balaam*, that the Spirit of God came upon him ; in *verse 16.* *Balaam* describes himself to be one that heard the words of God ; that knew the knowledge of the most high, and saw the visions of the Almighty, and all this was but the Spirit of God, which came upon him.

I might speak of the attributes of the Spirit, which are proper to the most high God, and prove him to be such, as of Omnipotency, Omniscience, Omnipresence, &c. But he himself hath held forth these in his Letter, when he lived about *Glocester*, which in my former Treatise is printed to the view of the World, at which time his eyes were open, and he saw these attributes in the Spirit, and acknowledged the holy Ghost to be God upon the sight thereof, though his

his Faith had been suspended before; but now he denies what he confessed then, and is left to blindness and darkness, and speaks opprobriously of the Spirit of Grace, when he calls him the instrument of an instrument; for he makes Christ himself no more but the Fathers instrument and a creature; and the Spirit is no more but Christs instrument, and a creature of a creature. I shall now conclude with an Answer to what he closeth his Answers to this Text of *Math. 28*, with. He saith, this kinde of presence by the Spirit, *Beza* and others understand to be intended in *Mat. 28.20*.

Reply. 1. Neither *Beza* nor any else save *Arians* and *Socinians* do hold such a kinde of presence of the Spirit, as he hath held forth, *viz.* of the Spirit as an instrument by which Jesus Christ did work, but only of the Spirit as God, and as the third person in the Trinity, equal with the Father & with the Son, by whom the Father and Son do work, not as by an instrument, but as by an associate, not as imparting any superiority in them, or inferiority in the Spirit, but Order only, that they which are one in Essence but distinct in personality, might not be confounded (as they cannot be divided from one another) in operation; therefore as they are in one another, so they work from and by one another.

2. The words which he mentions in the Mar-

gent, as *Bezaes* upon the place, though I have diligently perused *Beza*, I cannot find neither in *Matthew* the Text that is controverted betwixt us ; nor yet in any of those Texts in *John* which speak of the Spirit which he cites : neither would they be any whit advantageous to him, were they found in *Beza*; for they speak of Christ as absent in body, which none denies; but that whole Christ is absent is not asserted, in the words ; but the contrary seems to be implyed; for the absence of Christ is limited to his body, *Ceterum corpore abest*, are the words, so that Christ may be present in that spirit of holiness, which is his divine Nature, of which *Paul* speaks in *Rom. I. 4.* without any contradiction to *Beza*, if any such words may be found in him.

3. The words of *Beza* upon the place do differ greatly from the words he presents as his, and do not favour his exposition at all, but may well be interpreted so as to cohere with the use I make of that Text, *Cum autem idem ipse dominus paulo ante dixerit, &c.* saith *Beza*; that is, When as the self-same Lord Jesus had said a little before, *Me you shall not have alwayes, and was to ascend a little after*; it is apparent that there must be a distinction, respecting the maner and way of Christ's presence and absence ; in body he is absent, but in vertue he is wholly most present ; in which vertue he doth communicate himself, and all his

his things really in a spiritual way by faith unto us. Here is not one Word of the Spirit of God, but of the virtue and power of Christ in which he is present, which cannot be the virtue of his body, or of his Humane Nature in which he was so far absent; for none of that could extend so far unless conveyed by that which was present, viz. the divine Nature, which is present everywhere, and conveys virtue from whole Christ to believers.

The next Scripture which he invades, and labours to overthrow, is *Rev. 2. 2. I know thy works*; whence I infer Christs Godhead, because otherwise at such distance he could not know^y all their works. But he answers with Interrogatories of admiration, because of the absurdity which he pretends to apprehend in it: His words are these.

What could he not? Is any thing too hard for the Lord? Could the Prophet *Elisha* know at a very great distance what the King of *Syria* said in his Bed-chamber, and yet cannot Christ know at a distance? He hath the Spirit, viz. Wisdom, and power, &c. given him without measure. *Job. 334.* and therefore can know beyond what we can conceive.

Rep. When our Lord Jesus Christ tells the Churches that he knows their works, his scope is not to discover to them what knowledge he had by revelation from the Father, but it was to make them sensible what quick sharp piercing

eye-sight he himself had, and what a vaste incomprehensible understanding and knowledge he had, for the comfort of all true Saints, and for the terror of all Hypocrites in all the Churches; and this is manifest from 23. ver. of the same Chapter; & had he but read the Chapter over, he would not have admired at me, *viz.* at my collection, but at his own Answers; *I will kill her children* (saith Christ) *With death, and all the Churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the reines and hearts,* &c. In these words we may observe; first, what a knowledge it is that Christ hath of the works and wayes of the Church, and what it is he knows; it is an inward penetrating knowledge, it is of the most unsearchable parts, it is of the most hidden works, it is of the works of the hearts and reines of men. Secondly, how Christ came by this knowledge; not by any discovery that any other made to him, but by and from himself he hath this knowledge; it is a knowledge which he hath in himself, it is his own knowledge, I search the hearts and the reines. Thirdly, for what end Christ declares this his exquisite and perfect knowledge of all things in man, which he hath in himself, that all the Churches may know who he was, what an one he was, more observant of all secret wickedness then they were aware of, that they might fear & tremble more in reference to the

the eye of Christ, then they did before. Fourthly, what this science or knowledge of Christ doth denote and demonstrate Christ to be, no less then the most high God ; for the most high God doth assume power and perfection of searching and trying hearts and reines to himself, as his own proper prerogative, which none is enabled to challenge; in *Jer.* 17 9 10. *The heart is deceitful, and desperately wicked, who can know it?* as if he should have said, None can know it? But then he excepts himself, *I the Lord search the heart and try the reines;* that is, I alone do it ; and yet Christ attributes this high Divine transcendent knowledge to himself, and with such suitable words, as if Christ were the person speaking in *Jeremie*, or as if the person speaking in *Jeremie* spake also in the Revelation, as if one and the same person spake in both places for they challenge one & the same thing ; & the close of the speech in both places is the same, and it shews that one and the same God speaks in both places, if not one and the same person. And now if Mr. *Knowles* have any ingenuity in him, he will open his eyes, and lie under the conviction of this Text, unless he have sold himself to be deluded, and to seduce others.

It appears by what hath been presented, that he cannot evade the strength of this Text of *Rev.* 2.2. and the collection made therefrom,

with his instance of *Elisha*, who knew what the King of *Syria* spake in his Bed-chamber, which was done, not by any wisdome that was in him, but by the revelation of God; but Christ's knowledge was not such, was not from an other but from and in himself: But he rests not in that, but flies to the Spirit, which (he saith) *Was given unto him beyond all measure*, Joh. 3.34. But what is this Spirit which was given to him, which made him thus wise, that he could know all the works of the Churches? This Spirit is in his opinion but a creature; he called him but very lately Christ's instrument; and his whole scope in his Book is to shew that the Father alone is God, the most high God; therefore according to him the Spirit is but a creature: And shall Christ have all this help from a creature, to know all the works of the Churches? Doth the Spirit himself know all the hidden workings of the hearts of all Churches? and of all Saints? There are works of the hearts and reines; doth the Spirit know them, if he be but a creature? The Scripture tells us that none can know them but God, *Psal. 26.2. & 139. 23.* and *Jer. 11.20. & Chap. 20.12.* But he saith the Spirit is not God, therefore cannot know such things; therefore by the gift of him Christ cannot come to know such things. And how comes the Spirit being but a creature to know more then

Christ,

Christ, and to be Christs instructor, when Christ is the chief of all the creatures, and a God in wisdom and strength in comparison of them according to his opinion? is not here an inconsistency which doth always attend falsehood? Nor can the Spirit without measure be given to Christ, if the Spirit (as he asserts) be but a creature; for then himself is measured, being finite, and not infinite, and must be given in measure; therefore by the gift of him Christ cannot know all things. Yea further it may be said, though the Spirit were infinite, as indeed he is infinite, and is good (whatever he weakly and sinfully asserts to the contrary) yet Christ being but a creature (as he desperately argues) he cannot be given without measure; for things are received according to the capacity of that which doth receive, and not above it; and so Christ being finite (as he holds) and measurable, doth stint and limit, and bring to a bound, and to a measure all that he receives; and indeed his humane nature that did receive the Spirit, being finite, was not capable of the Spirit without measure, though the Spirit himself be without measure; but it is an hyperbolical expression, and the meaning is, Christ had abundance of the Spirit, as he was man, beyond all men, and all creatures; but no finite proportion of the Spirit will enable Christ as man to know

by his own wisdom that resides in him, all the works of all the Churches ; for none but the searcher of all hearts can do that, because there are may hidden works of the heart : Now this Searcher of hearts is God only, therefore Christ is God.

But he goes on and saith, *Though Christ hath such a knowledge, yet he is not the most high God, for his knowledge is of another, Joh.5.30. I can of mine own self do nothing, as I hear I judge, &c.*

Repl. I have already answered some parallel Scriptures to this in my former Treatise, pag. 145. to which I refer the Reader. I shall adde something out of *Beza* and *Chemnitius*, and so pass over it. *I can do nothing of myself, that is faith he, meo unius arbitratus, & potentia. vel voluntate à patre separata, cum una & eadem sit patris & mea tum potentia, tum voluntas, ut & essentia;* that is, by my own single proper power or will, separate and apart from the Fathers, *I can do nothing*, when as my Fathers will and power, and mine are one and the same, even as the Essence is one. [As I hear.] The Fathers shewing (faith he) and the Sons hearing do relate to one another ; that is nothing but the Fathers giving community of vertue, and power, and of the very Essence it self by generation from Eternity to the Son ; and the Sons hearing is nothing but the reception of it. Or, saith he, it

may

may respect the humane nature of Christ. Christ as man acts nothing, doth nothing apart from the will of his own Diety; for though the Divine will and the humane be two wils in number, yet they be not two but one in consent and agreement, and so one with the Fathers will. And Christ as man, as he hears, that is, as the Father suggests to him, so he judgeth, which is true of the Divine will in Christ suggesting to the humane. And *Chemnitius* in his Harmony, interprets the Sons not doing any thing of himself, to arise not out of the imbecillity of the Son, but from the absolute and perfect identity of the Father and the Son in Essence, and all essential properties and acts; and the Sons hearing, he expounds to be the Sons knowing together with the Father all things decreed in the secret Counsel of the Divinty, or Divine Essence. And without doubt, the undivided operations of the Father and Son are pointed out. *As I hear I judge*, saith Christ, and in *Joh. 8.15. I judge no man*, and ver. 50. *the Father seeketh and judgeth*, and yet in *Joh. 5.22 The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son*; These Scriptures cannot be reconciled better then to say, they judge in one another, the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, they act undividedly; the Father is in Christ in all Christs operations and the Son sees and hears, and knows the Father, and the

the things of the Father in himself.

'He concludes his answer to this text of Rev. 2. 2. thus, *Though he alwayes knew all things necessary for the perfect discharge of his offices, yet there was a time when he was excluded from the knowledge of the hour and day of judgement,* Mark 13. 32. *But of that day and hour no one knoweth, neither the Angels that are in heaven, nor the Son, neithers the Father: Therefore his knowledge was not formally of himself, nor alwaies perfect.*

Rep. This text of *Mark* is to be interpreted of Christ according to the humane nature, as he is the Son of man; for in that sense he is also called the Son without any addition, I Cor. 15. 28. compared with 23. for Christs manhood is there spoken of; for it is said, Christ should first rise, which as man he onely doth; and then ver. 28. he is called the Son, which must refer to the same consideration of Christ as man.

And if it were otherwise, that Son were alwaies taken for Son of God, yet sometimes a thing is spoken of in one nature, and must be understood in another. Acts 20. 28. it is called the bloud of God, but it is meant of the humane nature, because considered as God, Christ hath not any bloud. And as the Son of man, is higher then the Angels, and knoweth more then the Angels; having a more excellent anointment then they; therefore the gradation is consistent, and

and suitable enough, neither the Angels nor the Son according to flesh, which you will think more strange, because he is wiser then the Angels.

And whereas he seems to limit it to the Father onely, it must not be understood exclusively, as shutting out Christ as he is the Son of God from eternity, or as shutting out the Spirit; for (first) if the words *εἰ μὲν*, interpreted by him *unlesse*, and translated (*but*) be alwaies exclusive of all but the person mentioned, then the Father would be excluded from knowing himself; for *Mat. 11. 27.* the words run thus, No one knoweth the Father unlesse the Son, and so it is asserted of the Son, no one knoweth the Son, but the Father, or unlesse the Father; and so the Son is excluded from the knowledge of himself, if the particle *unlesse*, be always exclusive, which would be monstrous to be granted. 2. It is manifest that the holy Ghost, or Spirit of God knows the day and hour of judgement; for it is said of him, that he searcheth the deep things of God, and this must be granted to be one of them, *1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.* In which text it is to be observed that the exceptive particle *εἰ μὲν μέλεις*, is to be found by which both Father and Son are excluded from knowing the things of God, if we may believe him, that this particle limits it only to him that is mentioned; for the Spirit

is onely mentioned. 3. It is inconsistent to what is asserted of Christs knowledge, *Colos.* 2. 3. it is said that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid in him; how then should he be ignorant of the day of judgement as he was the Son of God? And *John* 5. 20. the Father sheweth the Son all things that himself doth, that is, in himself the Father shews all things; now this is one thing that the Father doth, he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world; and this is shewed in Christs very essence, which is the same with his Fathers, and in Christs very will, which is the same with his Fathers, and Christ may read all the decrees of the Father in himself, in his own wisdome and will: And he is called the wisdome of the Father, and the admirable counsellour, *I Cor.* 1. 24. *Esay* 9. 6. And the Disciples attributed to him the knowing of all things, *John* 16. 30. and *John* 21. 17. 4. It is inconsistent to the place which he cites, that Christ should be absolutely ignorant of the day and hour of judgement; to the context on every hand; for Christ had told all the forerunners of it, the things that should precede, and something that should follow, the temper of men of that age when it should be, the security that should be in the world at that time; he himself was to be the person that must come as Judge, and he was to depart, and then to come, and he

he was to appoint every one his work till he come, till the very day and hour of his coming, (the parable declares so much) and could he then be ignorant of the day and hour ? it is against sense and reason. Christ then had knowledge of the very precise time of judgement, and yet he had not knowledge, (he saith so himself) how is it to be understood ? as he was the Son of man according to the man-hood he had not the knowledge thereof, but as he was the Son of God he had the knowledge thereof. *Col. I. 15.* was next produced by me, to prove the eternal generation of Christ by it ; But he had perverted the true sense of it before he came to it, and made use of it to serve his own purpose by it, while he was pleading for that unchrist-like doctrine which he had received, and was ingaged to maintain it. And in this place he only tells me he had spoken to it, and with a scornful jeere prayes me to consider it again, and by my next to let him hear what part thereof it is in which Christs eternal generation may be seen.

Rep. In this text of *Col. I. 15.* Christ is called the first born of every creature, and his eternal generation was meant by it, which I have proved already in my other Treatise, and shall yet again manifest it. 1. First-born is not the same with first created ; 1. because it cannot be proved by Scripture that Christ was created at all,

all, therefore not that he was first created. 2. In the beginning he was, but no mention of any beginning that he had. 3. There is expresse mention that heaven and earth were first created; for in the beginning they were created, and before the beginning nothing was created. 4. Christ was born according to the flesh, but he was not the first-born, but in fulnesse of time was born; therefore in reference to his humanity, and as he was the seed of the woman, he is not called first-born. 5. First-born and first-begotten are termes equivalent, and point at one and the same thing, *viz.* or some person that did perform such an act as begetting of Christ. 6. First-born, first-begotten and only-begotten are alike congruous; and may equally, so far as concerns the truth of the thing, be attributed to Christ; so that whatever is the meaning of such titles or names, there is a peculiarity therein to Christ, and Christ hath therein no fellows; and so it can neither be applyed to creation, nor to ordinary and temporary generation; for it cannot be said that Christ was onely created, nor onely generated, and begotten, nor onely born; for there were numerous creatures created, and innumerable generated in the ordinary way: But Christ was alone so begotten, and so born of God as none else were. 7. Christ speaks of himself that which none other can speak but he, *God pos-*

possessed me in the beginning of his way before his
workes of old : possessed me, how? As Eve posse-
sed Cain; for the word is one in the original, and
it is rendred gotten, and indeed he must be be-
gotten; so the Lord possessed Christ, got Christ,
begot Christ, in the beginning of his way ; and
when was that beginning ? in the beginning of
the world ? no : it was *before his works of old*,
or *ever the earth was*; and the earth was the first,
together with the heavens, in the beginning ;
yet Christ was before ; not in the beginning of
the creation, *but in the begining of Gods way*; now
Gods way was from everlasting; therefore Christs
going forth hath been from of old, from ever-
lasting, *Mich. 5. 2.* his decrees were from ever-
lasting, and God was ever working; therefore
it is explicated, *verse 23.* I was set up from ever-
lasting, in the beginning; the one interprets the
other, the beginning of Gods way is from ever-
lasting. Thus I have found eternal generation in
these words, first born ; and in his next let him
evade it if he can.

I shall now come to the consideration of *Col.*
1. 16. By him were all things created, &c. and
John 1. 3. All things were made by him, and with-
out him was made nothing that was made : In an-
swer to which he thinks he hath acted his part
gallantly; *but let us hear what it is that he saith.*

He puts the Scriptures into an argument, af-
ter

ter this sort, *He by whom all things were made, is the most high God; but all things were made by Jesus Christ*; therefore Jesus Christ is the most high God.

He grants the major in reference to the principal agent, but denies it in reference to an instrumental agent: And saith he asserts Jesus Christ to be onely an instrumental agent in the creation of the world.

Rep. I have already in many places of my other Treatise (because he often harps upon Christs instrumentalnesse to the Father, in creating all things) confuted this assertion; yet if he have any thing to say in the defence of it, I am willing to discusse it with him. And he produceth four reasons for the confirming of his position. I shall try the strength of them.

1. The book of the creatures speaks onely of one first cause, and principal agent of all things; of a Trinity of persons, in unity of essence, as principal agents in the work of creation, the whole creation is silent.

Rep. 1. If the book of the creatures were wholly silent: yet if the book of the Scriptures be not silent, we are to attend the book of the Scriptures; if the book of the creatures would have taught us all things that we ought to believe concerning God, what need had there been of the book of the Scriptures?

2. The

2 The book of the creatures doth teach many things which we understand not from them ; the defect is in us, not in it : we are dull in apprehending, and *slow of heart in believing* what the book of the Scriptures doth teach us, therefore may not conceive aright what the book of the Creatures doth teach us.

3 The heathen Philosophers from the principles of Reason have acknowledged a Trinity of Persons in the unity of Essence ; as *Mornens* a French Lord, in that exquisite piece of his, called *The truenesse of Christian Religion*, largely and satisfactorily shews, if the Reader will be at the pains to peruse him.

4 The inanimate creatures have some kind of impression of the Trinity upon them ; and *one God in three Persons* hath in a kind left his image and his resemblance upon them : The *Sun* begets *beams* and *rayes*, and from both these proceeds *light* ; and yet neither is the *Sun* before the *beams*, nor the *beams* before the *light* that proceeds from them, but in order onely and relation, so far as the *beams* are begotten, and the *light* proceeds ; but not in time : which doth adumbrate the coeterinity of the Three Persons. So also there is the Fountain, and there is the water that bubbles up, which is (as it were) begotten of the Fountain ; and there is the stream that proceeds from both ; and these are at once in time : for in the first moment

that there is a fountain, there is the bubling of water, or the rising up, or boyling of it ; and no sooner is the bubling, but there is an issuing or proceeding of water , the water runs from it, if there be passage : and yet in order the fountain is first, the bubling is next, and the proceeding of water is last, but they are together in time ; And may it not be said that the impression of the Trinity is here ? but the character in which the Trinity is written in the book of the creatures, is smaller and darker then that every one can read ; when yet things of the God-head, some of them may more easily be spelled forth.

5. Though we affirm that the Father creates, and the Son creates, and the Holy Ghost creates, and that these three are three persons, yet we do not hold that these three are three reall distinct Agents, but one Agent. For they are all of them but one thing, & but one God ; and so really but one Agent ; but this one Agent subsists divers ways in three persons, as one God subsists divers ways in three persons, and these persons are not another thing from that one God, and so not another thing from that one Agent. So that he goes upon a mistake, while he disputes against three principall Agents. As suppose there were one soul in three bodies, moving them alike in all operations, and acting by them ; these three bodies would not

not be three Agents, but one Agent, though all the bodies perform the work. And if there be one God in three persons, (or which is all one) subsisting three manner of ways, yet the three manner of ways of subsisting, doth not make three Gods, nor three Agents. But there is no similitude that will rightly and exactly, and fully in all things hold forth the working of God in trinity of persons ; only some little crevice of light may be opened, to give a little insight into this truth.

6. Our Divines when they have confessed that God is known by the Creation, but have denied that God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are known thereby ; they have meant it of a demonstrative knowledge which of God men may arrive at ; but of the Trinity they cannot; yet there may be some things that may shadow it out, though very darkly.

7. It is certain, that that which is clearly seen of God in the Creation, belongs to his Essence. For the Apostle tells us so much, Rom. i. 20. *his Godhead is seen, things belonging to his Essence, viz. his power, his wisdome, the liberty of his will, his goodnessse, holinessse;* and many more properties belonging to his Essence, which are common to all the persons; but those substantiall, personall properties, they are not by any visible characters to be discern'd.

But he objects against our Divines, for

saying, God is known from the Creation, but not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and he objects against the reason that they render, viz. *That the efficient force and vertue by which the World was created, belongs to the Essence of God, and not to the personall subsistence*; his words are these,

Yet by their leave, God is a Person, all actions being proper unto persons, therefore by their grant, the work of creation holds forth but one Agent: for it is not imaginable, that if there were more then one principall Agent, they should not all be equally discovered by the work.

Repl. I have answered unto this, Gods being a Person, and have declared that God rather imports essentiality, then personality; yet withall, I have shewed that essence is never separated from person, but subsists in it; and if God be properly spoken of, there the essence is meant, as it subsists in three persons, in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Yet when it respects acting things without them, these three persons act in that which is common to them all, and wherein they are in one, and not wherein they are distinguished, and are three; they act by the same essentiall property, as power, wisdome, &c. and these are one and the same in them all, and so it is Gods work in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and

and not the Fathers work alone and apart; nor God the Sons work alone and apart, nor God the Holy Ghost's work alone and apart, nor yet the work of all these wherein they differ, and are three distinct from each other, but the work of all as they are one. And the Father is no more discovered then the Son, nor any one more then other, but God in all is discovered. So that he is upon a mistake when he speaks of three principall Agents, that must be discovered in the work of creation. For these persons that are, work but one thing, one being, one God, one reall Agent ; for the very thing that the Father acts, the Son acts, and the Holy Ghost acts, and the power is one, and the wisdome is one, and the act is one.

Or suppose it were granted, that there are three principall Agents, yet there are not three Agents essentially distinct, but personally only; and so it comes all to one, whether one say that there are three Agents, that may be called principall ; or whether one say, there is one principall Agent : for the one Agent is in three persons, and acts with some personall diversity, and the three Agents are but one in essence, and but one thing, and act one thing, and by one power ; therefore it is not materiall how it is expressed.

Agent, as it relates to God, may admit of

the same distinction as is made when we speak of God : *Agent* is considered either *essentially*, or *subsistentially* : *Essentially*, and then there is but one, as there is but one God. *Subsistentially*, and then there are three, as there are three Persons : But they do not differ really and essentially one from another, as the Persons do not ; but onely in the manner of acting.

And *Agent* taken personally, though they should be three, yet need not be discovered each of them in the work, because as they are essentially one, so they work one individuall work by one individuall power, and force, and efficacy, which is numerically the same, and therefore cannot leave a distinct impression in any work.

His second Argument by which he would prove Christ to be but an instrumental Agent in creating the world, is fetch'd from Reason : his words are these.

The second reason proceeds from the verdict of pure Reason : If Reason may obtain credit, she will tell us, that there could be in the work of Creation but one principall agent, because there is by nature but one God ; for if there were two principall agents, there must be two Gods, the terms being convertible.

Repl. I. There is neither pure Reason nor clear Reason to be found among men ; and while

while he pleads so earnestly for Reason, he loseth himself and the Truth in corrupted and darkened Reason, which he too much follows; and being in pursuit after Reason what it will present, he turns aside from Scripture, and attains not the knowledg of the Truth, which he would seem to contend for.

Rep. 2. He argues from plurality of Agents in the Creation, to plurality of Gods: which would have force and strength in it, if we held plurality of Agents really and essentially distinct from one another: but if the Agent be one in essence, and personally onely more then one, (which is the doctrine we hold) no such absurd consequence will follow, that there should be two or more Gods, because there are two or more Agents personally (but not essentially) differing from one another.

3. His third Reason issues from the nature of Christ's being. Christ is the image of the invisible God, and so is distinguished from God, because the image and the thing whereof it is an image is not the same, in that nothing can be the image of it self. Col.1.15.

Repl. Where it is said, that Christ is the image of God, God is there taken Synechdochically, or personally for the Father, as will appear, if you compare it with Heb.1.3. where he is called the express image of his Fathers person. Now Christ may be the image of the Father,

and yet not the image of himself; for though God, taken essentially, do not differ from himself, and therefore he cannot in that sense be the image of God, and be God himself, because he should then be the image of himself; yet God taken personally, for the Father, may differ from himself, taken personally for the Son; that is, one person may, doth differ from another, and one may be the image of another, the Son of the Father; and may in that sense be the image of God, and yet not of himself, though he be God.

But he renders a reason why Christ is called the image of God. *Because (saith he) God did manifest his divine glory and dominion over the creature through him chiefly, for which reason also man is called the image and glory of God,* 1 Cor. 11. 7.

Repl. Christ according to his manhood may be called the image of God, because of that glory and dominion that he was lifted up to, for he was made head of all principality and power; but he was the image of God in an higher way also: *viz. as he was a Son, Heb. 1. 2. 3.* which Sonship was before this collated Lordship, which he had; for he was a Son before there was any creature to rule over, as himself hath confessed; and if a Son, then the image of his Father: but this was discussed in my former Treatise, therefore

I might have passed it over in silence.

He saith further, that *Christ is called the first-born of every creature.*

Repl. The urging and the answering of this is but to weary the Reader with frivolous repetitions; therefore I referre him to what hath been represented already, both in the former, and in this present Treatise, concerning this Title, *First-born of every creature.*

To conclude, The force of this argument lies in this; whole Christ is a creature, and therefore but an instrumental Agent, & to prove the Antecedent, he produceth, *Col. 1.15.* produced before. He might have cited & rehearsed all those Arguments, & Scriptures of his which he brought before, & wherewith he filled many pages as aptly & fitly as he hath mentioned these, but with little profit or delight to the Reader.

I shall conclude my answer to this argument, that when ever he shall be able to prove Christ to be a creature, I will yeild him to be an instrumentall Agent. But then it must be done with repetitions.

I now come to answer his fourth reason, which (he saith) doth spring from the manner of Christ's working, saith he, though Christ had an hand in the Creation of the world, yet was it not originally of him. *1 Cor. 8.6.* All things are of the Father, but not of, but by Jesus Christ; the Father is made the first cause, and

and originall of all things, and Christ the instrument of the Father, 2. In that it is said in Scripture, that God acted by him in the work of creation, Ephes. 3. 9. where it is said, that God created all things by Jesus Christ, so in Heb. 1.2.

Repl. I find no new strength of argument here, but what I have met with before, & have largely answered before, in that former Treatise of mine; to which I referre the Reader; for I am ashamed to follow him in his causlesse iterations and repetitions, yet I shall add something to what I have represented, seeing he gives me an occasion.

As there is a distinct order of subsisting, so there is a distinct order of working. And the divine essence subsisting in three persons, these persons work in three distinct manners; the Son being begotten of the Father, worketh from the Father, *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do,* John 5.19. And the Father begetting the Son, worketh by the Son, *Col. 1.16. 20.* and in very many more places. So the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father, and from the Son, worketh from them both, in *John 16. 13.* *He shall not speak of himself, but as he hears so shall he speak, and he shall take of mine, and shew unto you;* yet neither the Son, nor the Holy Ghost do work as instruments.

: The Son doth not, for that is the subject in hand
to

to be discussed, nor doth the Greek particle *διὰ*, (which is here translated *by*) shew so much; for it is prefixed to the works of the Father, as well as to the works of the Son, *Gal. 1. 1. Paul an Apostle, not of men, nor by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.* Here we may observe three things, 1. That these particles, or prepositions are not always distinguishing particles, putting difference betwixt thing and thing, to which they are applyed; but they many times are promiscuously used, and are confounded; for [*of* and *by*] applied to men, do import the same thing. 2. The particle *by*, doth not declare the person to whom it is applied to be an instrument; for it is applied to the Father equally as to Jesus Christ. But he will not assert the Father to be an instrument. 3. That whereas the Father and the Son are mentioned together, they are made equall in manner of working, and they are either both instruments, or both principall Agents, and Efficients; for *Paul was an Apostle by Jesus Christ, and by God the Father, and Jesus Christ hath the leading place.* In *Rom. 11.36. For of him, and by him, and to him are all things.* Here the particle *διὰ*, which is translated *by*, or *through*, is attributed to God, and he will say, that the Father is meant, and only the Father; and we may observe two things. 1. According to the truth of the thing,

thing, the particles *of* and *by* are all one ; and that *by* doth not import any instrumentalness ; for God in no sense can be an instrument. 2. According to the sense that he puts upon the particle *by*, God is both the principall Agent, because *of him* are *all things* : and he is also the Instrument of all things, for *by him* are *all things*. Also in *Heb.* 2. 10. where the Creation is spoken of and attributed to the Father, and not to the Son, it is not attributed to him as something *ξετόν*, but as somthing *σιτόν*, not as *of him*, but as *by him* : The words are these, *It behoved him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to make the Prince and Captain, &c.* Yet he will not say that the Father is an Instrument. I shall not multiply places, these Texts are sufficient to shew the absurdity and falseness of the gloss that he puts upon the prepositions [*of*] and [*by*].

That which he asserts of the Fathers, that they frequently call him Gods instrument, and servant, is true of Christ as the son of man, according to his humane nature ; and they call him no other then the Prophet, *Isa.* 42.1. which must he so understood.

In the next place, after his Arguments, where he placed his own strength for the proving of Christs instrumentalness in *Creation*, he comes to consider my Argument against it, which was this :

God could not make use of an instrument in the work of creating of the world.

To this he answers, 1. *This Assertion derogates from Gods al-sufficiency : Is any thing impossible with God ? is any thing too hard for the Lord ?*

Rep. This Assertion, as it is laid down, with a reason to explain it, is so far from derogating from Gods al-sufficiency, that it is the magnifying of Gods al-sufficiency: there is such an infinity of perfection in Gods al-sufficiency, that it is incomunicable to the creature: God cannot make another as sufficient as himself ; that is , It is so transcendently excellent, that no creature is capable of it. And whereas he demands, Is any thing too hard for God ? Is any thing impossible to the Lord ? he may receive this answer, What-ever may be done by power, God can do it, because he hath sufficiency of power in himself to do it : But that which cannot be done in the nature of the thing, which implies a contradiction if it were supposed to be done, that is impossible with God, or in it self rather : as, It is impossible for the most high God to make a God most high, because God most high hath his being of himself, and is uncreated and eternall, and gives being to other things. Therefore a created most high God carries a contradiction with it, therefore is a thing not to be done, and God cannot do it ; yet it argues not any weakness

weakness in God because he cannot do it.

2. He saith I contradict my own testimony, and he minds me of the time.

I remember (saith he) that in a Conference (where I exercised both silence and patience, to the glory of God) since I received your paper, you did affirm (in the hearing of not a few) that God might have made an Angel, or some other creature at the first, and by it have made all things.

Repl. I do remember that time he speaks of, and so do some scores of persons as well as I, & will remember it while they live, whereth he exercised not silence altogether, for he spake at the last in the close of the conference, & it had been better he had been silent, then to speak as he did, for he asserted an untruth in those few words he did speak: he uttered words to this purpose, That it was strange to him, that he should be brought upon the stage in so publick a way, for holding such an opinion, when he had not declared himself in a positive way at any time about it: Which caused me to mind him of his first Sermon in which he broached his opinion in a positive way, in this assertion, *That Christ is not the ultimate and last rest of Saints, but the Father; and that Christ was but the way to it.* Which, if Christ be coessentiall with the Father, is false; therefore his assertion did deny by an undeniable conse-

consequence the coessentiality of Christ with the Father. And at another time he publickly in his preaching speaking his opinion on John 3.13. *No man bath ascended up into heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven,* said, that he could not conceive how Christ being at that time on earth, could be in heaven, unlesse it were in respect of that knowledg which he had of the Father, and the things of heaven : or words to this effect. In which he denied the omnipresence of Christ, and consequently the Godhead of Christ : And yet in that short speech of his he would make fair weather of it, and put a face upon it, as if he were not the man he was taken for.

Concerning his *patience*, not I alone, but many others did judge it stupidity rather then patience ; for scarce any one that had had the spirit of a man, could have been dumb, and not open his mouth, when he was so palpably called forth to appear in the cause. It did certainly strike amazement in very many, that knew he was there, and yet could not hear him speak one word, having so many strong invitations thereto; Or if it were not stupidity, it was cumming craftiness; for he knew how to make advantage by being here and keeping silence, and he could reserve himself in point of speaking to a more hopefull time, and fairer opportunity

pportunity ; in which he might by speaking propagate his opinion ; there was little hope of advantaging his cause at that time, when there were so many to contradict him. And yet he might feele mens pulses by being there, and discern who were his friends, and who his enemies, and who might probably be wrought upon, and who not.

But (he saith) *it was to the glory of God, that he exercised silence and patience.* But it was every way the dishonor of God, for if truth were in his tenent, then he shamefully deserted it, when he should have committed himself to God in the maintaining of it, who ever opposed it. And if Errour and Heresie were in his tenent, then he carried it craftily to do the more mischiefe, for he thought it wisdome to forbear when it might be much opposed, and to take time to speak, when it might be more prevalent, that he might draw away the more Disciples after him.

But he tells me of a contradiction. Where lies it ? In these words, *God could make use of no Instrument in the worke of creation ; and God might have made use of an Angel, or some other creature, and by it have made all things.* Here is a contradiction indeed, if these assertions be taken separately, from other expressions that expounded them. And here lies the injury that he doth me, which an unengaged

gaged person, and stander by betwixt us, upon his first reading of this charge which he makes against me, of contradiction, (who was present at the conference) soone discovered, and expressed himselfe to this purpose, *That he should thinke the worse of Mr. Knowles while he knew him, for the wrong he did me in this matter.* He leaves out those words which cleared it from contradiction ; When I said, *God could use no instrument in the worke of creation,* I spoke of such an Instrument by whose force, and vertue, and power such a worke might be affected, as my after words clearly shew; because creation is the making of things out of nothing, and required an infinite power, which no creature is capable of, for it would make him a God. These words do demonstrate that I spake of an Instrument that might be co-operative with God in vertue and efficacy in so great a worke. But when I spake of an *Angell as an Instrument,* which God might have made use of in the creation of the world, if he would, I both meant it, and expressed it of such a kind of Instrument which contributes no vertue nor efficacy to the worke, but is a means without which God will not do such a worke, rather then a means by which he will do it ; such as the blowing with rams horns was for the bringing downe of the walls

of *Jericho*, in which there was no vertue for the effecting of such a worke, and so God might have made an Angell, and might have said to it, Go, say, Let there be Heavens and earth, and at the Angels speaking, it might have been ; not because there was any vertue in the Angels speaking for the production of such things; but the vertue is wholly Gods. But it is otherwise with Christ in his making of the World, the vertue is his owne, Christ is said to *support al things by the word of his own power*, and so by consequence to create all things by the word of his owne power. Now such an Instrument Christ could not be, nor any creature, nor could any creature be capable of any such power: and thus I expressed it upon that day of conference, as there are many witnesses. And yet thus he abuseth me, and then gloryes over me in a large manner, and triumphs excessively. His words are these :

How to reconcile one with another is unfeasible, you must confess you are not always infallible, you sometimes differ from your selfe, and then no wonder if you disagree with others. What shall I take for your judgment , &c ?

And thus he goes on in a vapouring way, with a deal of stuff such as this, and his glorying over me in this, (seeing I am innocent wherein he accuseth me) is not my shame, but his.

After-

Afterwards, when he had testified his high estimation of reason in some hyperbolical; or rather phantastical expressions, *as prestrating himselfe to the shadow of it, rather then to any mans testimony,* (if he had spoken so much of Scripture, I should have liked it better) he examines my reason, why God could make use of no Instrument in creation of the world.

My reason was this, Creation is a making all things out of nothing, and requires an infinite power, which God cannot derive to any creature; and therefore he cannot make use of any Instrument in creating.

His first answer that he gives is this, *That Gods infinite power was manifested in the worke of creation, yet was not the infinity of his power manifested fully in that, or any other worke;* for he hath more power then ever yet he had need to use, or then could in any worke be fully declared.

Repl. In this answer there seems to be 1. absurdity, 2. Impertinency, 3. Evasion. The absurdity is in this, there is a distinction put without a difference appearing: he would make infinite power manifested, and infinity of power manifested, to be two things, and yet they are the same thing; for infinite power and infinity of power are both one thing, and infinite power manifested, and infinity of

power manifested must consequently be one thing also. The *impertinence* lies in this ; My Argument runs of one thing, his answer is to another thing ; I speake of infinite power derived to the creature, and say the creature is not capable of it; he tells me of infinite power manifested, and so speaks not to the purpose. The *evasion* appears in this, he saith that the infinity of Gods power was not manifested fully in that work of creation, or in any other ; but what of this ? If it was not fully manifested, yet was it not truely manifested ? so as that the rationall creature might be able to say , the power that was put forth in making such creatures of nothing, is infinite, no less then the power of the most high God ? as sometimes the Magicians of *Egypt* said, this is the finger of God, the power of God, which transcends the power that any creature is capable of. And if infinite power was truly manifested, how is the Argument enervated, or wherein invalidated ? And if infinity of power be not fully manifested, what is the reason of it ? Doth it not imply a contradiction in the sense in which he intends it ? For to assert that infinity of power is in such sort manifested in any work, as that he cannot further manifest it, but hath wrought to the utmost of his power, and can proceed no further, neither hath any more to use, is

to

to deny infinity of power to be in God ; and there is a contradiction in it *in adjecto*, a contradiction implied ; and such a manifestation would rather be an exhaustion of power, which is impossible where infinite power is.

His expressions of more power in those words of his, *he hath more power then ever yet he had need to use*, have truth in them in a sense, but in an other sense have fraud and falsehood in them; if he mean by more power, more of the same kind then ever yet he had need to use, it will be granted to him, without any advantage to him; for if God could spend his store, he could not be said to be infinite in power. It is certain, that God hath an inexhaustable treasure of power, and the more he manifesteth of it, he hath not the less to manifest, but can declare it millions of waies in which he hath not yet declared it ; and there may be yet more glorious effects of it if he shall please, then any that have been wrought. But this concession hurts not my assertion, viz. *that an infinite power is required in creation*; and he hath not denied the truth and clearness of the manifestation of it therein, though he say there may by a fuller manifestation of it, which God can effect, must needs be ; because every work will bear witness thereof in reference to

it self. But if he should mean by *more power* a greater power, or more in measure, and degree then yet he hath used and manifested in the creation, and in the works which he hath wrought, it must not be yeilded to him ; for though there might be a greater work, yet not a greater power, for the same power is manifested in the one as in the other, *viz.* an infinite power, and there are no degrees in that which is infinite ; though one worke may more fully speak to us that infinity of power which is put forth therein then an other doth.

The work of creation is that work that God glories in in the Scripture, and he doth appropriate it to himself, and doth give witness therein to the world, that he is the most high God, *Jer. 10, 10, 11, 12.* *And the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternall power and Godhead,* so that the very heathen are left without excuse, *Rom. 1. 20.*

And a greater work then creation is, from which an ampler testimony of the infinity of Gods power may be fetched for the conviction of the creature, in some sense there can be none ; for there is an infinite distance betwixt something and nothing, and onely an infinite power can get over it : for that which cannot

cannot be measured is infinite, but the distance betwixt something and nothing is such as cannot be measured ; and creation is a bringing of something out of nothing, therefore the power that effects it must be infinite : therefore infinite power or infinity of power is manifested in great fulnesse and clearenesse in creation.

His 2^d. answer that he gives is this,

2. *Your assertion plainly denyes the man Christ Jesus to be God Almighty, or infinite in power; for you say, that God could not give or derive an infinite power to any creature, and that a creature cannot be God Almighty, &c. The man Christ Jesus was a creature, How then can that person be God?*

Repl. This reasoning is unworthy a man of parts; a very child that hath learned the first principles, might answer him. The man Christ Jesus is a creature ; that is, the son of *Mary*, the seed of *Abraham* is a creature ; and I do deny this seed of *Abraham*, as the seed of *Abraham*, to be God, or Almighty, or capable of an infinite power, and therfore God could not derive it, nor was Christ Almighty as man, as the son of man ; But this man Christ Jesus was God, as well as man, that is, this person Christ Jesus, was both God and man ; not that the manhood was turned into the Godhead, and so became God, but that the

eternall Son of God, who is by nature God, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, assumed manhood, tooke the nature of man, the seed of *Abraham*, and became one person with it, and this person was Almighty, as he was the Son of God, not as man; and this almightynesse was not by derivation from the Father, but was an essentiall attribute in him.

His third Argument is this,

The Ground (saith he) of your Argument is straw and stubble; for infinite power may be manifested by them to whom 'tis not communicated. And he gives instances many.

Repl. Because I foresaw he might give such an answer, therefore on that day of the conference, which he spoke of, I mentioned such an instrument which he now speaks of, which is not the subject of the power, but a meanes without which God will not exercise the power which he himselfe is the subject of: and I granted, God might have made use of such an instrument, but Christ in creation (as also in preservation) is the subject of the power, and I spoke of such an instrument which is the subject of power, and shewed it was impossible that there should be such an instrument, and therefore Christ having such power in himselfe could not be an instrumen-tall, but the principall Agent.

He comes in the last place to consider of
the

the Minor of the Argument, which he had cast the Scriptures I produced into, fetched from Christs creating, which is this: *All things were made by Christ Jesus.*

His answer is.

It is true, Christ being excepted, of whose creaturall being I have already spoken.

But against this answer he frames an objection.

Obj. *You will say (saith he) that in Job.1.3. it is said, that without him was nothing made that was made.* And he answers it,

Sol. *The words are to be restrained to all those things which by the use of an instrument were made; in the first verse the creation of Jesus Christ is included, and in this 3 verse he is spoken of as the instrument of God in creating all things; therefore he is there to be excepted.* And he gives some instances, which I omit the mention of, because I shall have no need to return answer to them.

Rep!. If indeed the creation of Jesus Christ be included in *ver.1.* then I shall grant that Jesus Christ is excepted in *ver. 3.* but if not, then *ver. 3.* is strong against him. The words in *ver 1. In the beginning was the word;* and that is granted by both sides, that then he *was;* but that then he *began* is not asserted by the Apostle and is denied by us: if he will have it to be so, let him shew in his next how he will

will fetch out creation from these words, *In the beginning was the word.* God the Father was in the beginning; was God the Father therefore created in the beginning?

The next Scripture produced by me to prove Christ's Deity by, was *Heb. 7. 3.* *Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of dayes, nor end of life, made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest continually.* Christ is here resembled to *Melchisedech*, in reference to eternity. But what answer makes he to this text! Truly it is an impotent, lame, and poor answer.

Was Melchisedech (saith he) eternall? if so, then he was God, but he was neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Ghost; I hope you will not allow a quaternity of persons in unity of essence; and therefore will allow the words to be taken in a figurative sense; *Melchisedech was without beginning of dayes, and end of life,* in that there is no mention made either of his birth or death in the History of Moses, or especially in reference to his Priesthood; the time of it's beginning or ending, being not certainly known. So our High Priest Jesus Christ is without beginning of dayes, or end of life

Repl. This answer is too light and frothy in a subject so serious; It was not mine intent or designe, (and he knows it very well) to make *Melchisedech* God, nor any of the persons

persons of the Godhead, nor yet to make a quaternity of persons, but to make Christ God, to whom that in truth belongs, which in type only, and in a figure, mystically is attributed to *Melchisedech*. *Moses* and *David* speak of *Melchisedech*, as if he had been one who had glided down out of heaven, and come from above, and had again soon after conveyed himself thither; for there is not any mention at all made of his birth, or death, of his father, or mother, or kindred, or when he became Priest, nor when he laid down his Priesthood. And the Apostle saw the mysterie in it, and that it behoved him so to be described, and set out, that he might be a Type of Christ, both of his Person, and Priesthood. And therefore when he makes use of him as a Type to set out Christ by, he describes him to be without father, and so was Christ as he was man; and without mother, and so was Christ as he was God, having no beginning of dayes, nor end of life; nor had Christ (according to his divine Nature considered) either beginning, or end of dayes; but according to his humane, he had both, and both of them described, and well known by all that are versed in Scripture-story; and the Apostle knowing these things, in expresse words makes *Melchisedech* the Type of him, discerning, that the Holy Ghost (in concealing

ling these things of him) had made him so, and intended him to be so, as these words import, *Made like unto the Son of God, for he is described* (saith Beza) *as if he had neither been mortall man, nor had been born of a mortall Woman; which because it could by no means agree with any meer man born of men; therefore the Apostle saith, that he is peculiarly the figure of that one only begotten Son of God, and that it was so intended by the Holy Ghost.*

Now then the strength of the Argument fetch'd from this Scripture, lies here, First, *Melchisedech* is a Type of Christ; that is without controversie. Secondly, He is a Type in these things mentioned of him, *Without father, without mother, without beginning of dayes, and end of time.* Otherwise in vain doth the Apostle mention these things of *Melchisedech*, but as a type; for in truth, it was not so of *Melchisedech*. And it appears by the scope of the Apostle, which was to interpret the words of *David, A Priest after the order of Melchisedech*; therefore it was necessary for him to set forth what *Melchisedech* was in his person, and in his office; and in his person he was ἀπάτωρ ἀμύτωρ, &c. *Without father, without mother*, not in truth; but they are not mentioned, and so it is, as if it had been so, and that in type he might be so, and therein resemble the Son of God, that in truth was so.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *Melchisedech* (being only a type in these things of Christ) it was not necessary that he should be such in truth, but only in a figure, mystically, as indeed he was not; but it was necessary, that Christ should be so in truth, being the Anti-type, that is, being the substance of that which *Melchisedech* was but a shadow of; therefore in *John 1. 17.* it is said, that *the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* That is, there were many shadows in the law of *Moses*, but Christ came and fulfilled them, and was the truth of them. We read of *David*, that he said of himselfe, *They pierced my hands and my feet, they gave me vineger and gall to drink;* which really were not done to *David*, but mystically, and in a figure, as *David* was the type of Christ; but these things were really done to Christ, and in truth were fulfilled in Christ. So the bloud of bulls and calves and of such beasts which were sacrificed, and offered, they took away sin, cleansed away the guilt, and brought pardon, and purged the conscience, and brought peace; but none of these did so in truth, but mystically, in type only, as they shadowed out, and pointed at the sacrifice of Christ, and at his bloud: but the bloud of Christ really and in truth did take away sin, did clese the conscience, did bring remission & peace, *Heb.9.9, 12,13,14.*

More-

More instances might be given, but indeed there is evidence enough in the very nature of a type, and antitype. There is a mystery in the type, and there is the impletion or fulfilling of the mystery in the Antitype, or the thing of the mystery, is to be seen in the Antitype. But enough of this, unless he had said more to impugne it.

I now come to consider of his answer to Pro. 8. 22. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.*

To this he thus answers, And gives this sense.

The Lord, who is Possessour of heaven and earth, obtained or created me, when he began to worke, before his antient workes: And I was set up, or annoynted to have the dominion of all things, and that from everlasting, that is, from the beginning, before the earth was.

Repl. The word indeed signifies, to obtain, or to possess, which is sometimes done by creation, and so when heaven and earth were created they were possessed by God; or as he saith, God was Possessour of them. But in this place, it is an obtaining or possessing as is done by generation; I gave an instance in Eve in reference to Cain. I have gotten a man: it was

was by a begetting or generating there, and in this place it is so also ; Christ is called the onely begotten of the Father : and here in ver. 24. Christ the wisdome of God, declares, how he was possessed, *viz.* as a *Son* that is brought forth by a woman travelling; in which Christ is said to be born, and is called the first-born, to exclude creation, and that it might be by generation; and the act of the Father in communicating the divine essence to the Son, is called (after the manner of men, that it may be better conceived of) a begetting, or generating, suitable to which is the Hebrew word *Amun*, v. 30. w^{ch} signifies a child nursed, nourished, brought up with a father, and such was Christ ; which is thus expressed, to hold forth his generation, and not creation ; for when God created *Adam* he created him a man ; but Christ is represented as a child, to shew how he was begotten: and it is added, that Christ was his Fathers delight, and a sport before him, (for so it is in the Hebrew) and this is *humanitūs dictum*, it is spoken after the manner of Fathers, who take dear delight in the childe that comes out of their owne bowels ; and when it is little, it is very pleasant, and makes the Father sport ; and by it is signified to us, what an one Christ was, what a son he was, that he was his owne proper son, not created but generated ; having his very essence from the Father,

ther, by an act of eternall generation, and in whom God taketh delight, after the manner of parents in a child that comes out of their bowells, and is a part of themselves, thatis, the highest & dearest delight, and the most naturall and intimate delight, beyond which there neither is or can be any delight. It is manifest therefore that he confounds things that must not be confounded, he would have possessing or obtaining to be one with creating in this place, but it is a gross mistake in him.

But when was it that God did thus possess or beget Christ? He would have it to be *when God began to work; then God created Christ* (saith he) *before his works of old.* But it is manifest, that the very words, that set forth Gods eternity are used here. See two of the words, *Magnolam* which signifies from everlasting, and *Meas* which signifies *à tunc*, from then; or from of old, as it is translated; and both are used in *Psal. 39. 2.* and applied to the most high God. *Thy throne is established of old, thou art from everlasting;* and *kedem* is in many places applyed to God, for such antiquity which is eternity, *Deut. 33. 27. the eternall God is my refuge;* so that Christs eternity is set forth in this place of the *Proverbs,* He was brought forth or possessed from eternity. And though it be said, *in the beginning of his way,* yet this makes nothing against Christs eternity,

eternity, because it is added, that it was before his works; so that this [was] points at eternity: for who will assert that creation was the beginning of Gods way? did God act nothing before he created ? it is undoubtedly false. So that again he is to blame to confound *beginning* (as he understands beginning) and *everlasting*, as if they were one, when as they differ as much as *eternity* and *time* do differ.

But he presents us with the Septuagint version; but it is not at hand, and I dare not take his word without viewing it, he hath so often deceived me in his quotations. Then he gives in *Montanus* his version; but that is not against my assertion, nor doth it favour his doctrine. Lastly, he alledges *ver. 30.* as speaking of Christ's being, before Gods works of old; but he saith it is a created being: but he is mistaken in the mention of the *verse*, for it speaks of no such thing, and I have made use of it against him.

Zech. 13. 7. hath the next place in my paper, and in his answer. The words are, *A-wake, oh sword, against my shepherd, against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of boasts.*

His answer is, *When you inferred coequality from this place, you hearkned rather to the sound then to the sense of our English word fellow, which doth not always note equality, as from*

Psal. 45.7. Heb. 19. you may be informed where the Saints are called the fellowes of Christ, and yet are not equall.

Repl. To evade the strength of this allegation from Zecharie, he flyes from the sound, to the sense of the English word fellow, and faith it signifies not alwayes equality, and yet he declares not in what other sense it is taken, neither can I imagine what sense he can devise or frame, other then equality ; for I appeale to all rationall English men, whether fellow be not equall, in our English acceptation of the word : not but that I grant that the person that is a fellow, and so an equall in some respect, may be a superior or in inferior in other respects, as a school-fellow, a play-fellow, a chamber-fellow, they are fellowes not in a generall latitude in all things ; but in a particular respect, so far as concerns such a busines, there is an equality, they are equally invested into the priviledges of the School, and carry on that work of learning with equality together ; and so in play, there is no respect of persons in it, but a parity and equality therein ; be they great or mean, they are all fellows, that is, equalls in that. And so it may be said of Christ in reference to Saints, though Christ have a superiority (even as he is the son of man, much more as he is the Son of God) over all them, and over Angels also, and all creatures ; yet

Christ

Christ is fellow to the Saints, and they fellows to him in some respects ; he calls them *brethren*, *Psal. 40. I will declare thy name unto my brethren* : He makes himself herein a fellow to them , and makes them fellows with him. *John 20. 17. Go to my brethren and say, I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and your God.* In bearing the crosse, he became like to them, yea, he set himself below them : in taking their nature upon himself, and infirmities, &c. he became like to them, and was as they , and became their fellow : and in condescension, in coming to minister, rather then to be ministred to, he was their fellow at the least, if not below their fellow. Persons of the same nature and essence may be fellows, equals : Kings and peasants were alike from *Adam*, do alike partake of flesh and blood, and were formed alike in the womb. But God and the creature can be equal in nothing; for finite cannot in any thing equal infinite.

2 He betakes himselfe to the Hebrew word and tels me, *If I had consulted with it, I would have been a stranger to so strange an inference*, and then tels me of divers acceptions of the word, as *Citizen*, *Neighbour*, *Second*, *Lientenant*, *Vicar*, *friend*; and alledgedh the *Septuagint*, which he saith translate it *citizen*, and *Tremelius*, which translates it *Proximum*, *Neighbour*, or *next*; *And Tremelius and Ju-*

nius in their Marginall notes, a near freind, one that stands over against another, and is at hand to all freindly offices: and makes it the same as to be in the bosome of the Father.

Repl. That the word in the Originall signifies, either Citizen, Lieutenent, Vicar, representative, is barely asserted; and if he have so strictly surveyed the originall, as that he dare challenge me for not surveying it, he might have done well to have directed me, or the Reader, to the places where the word admits of such acceptions; but this he hath not done, therefore I shall conclude, that either he hath presented his owne imagination instead of the true sense of the word, or more probably hath relied upon some who have deceived him. I have viewed the originall, and do find, that the word *Gnamith*, which is rendred *Socius, proximus*, proceeds from the radix *Gnammath*, which signifies *secundum, juxta*, and sometimes, *è regione, ex adverso*, and is as much as *Ca-asher*, which is rendred *prout*, all which do hold forth equality. To begin with this last, *prout* is rightly translated, even as, the son Christ is even as the Father. I suppose it cannot be spoken of any creature so, the words *è regione, ex adverso*, are rendred *over against, right against*, which is spoken of a thing or person that matcheth an other, set this against that to fellow it, or match

match it. But what creature is there that may be set up è *regione Dei patris*, opposite to God, to match him? And so, *secundum, juxta*, which signifie *according, hard by, beside* or *nigh* another thing, or person; and it is rendered equal, *juxta à jugo*, saith the Etymologist. Now fellows are joyned in the yoke, such a nighnesse, as that the son fellows the Father; And if the words do any of them, sometimes in their use, import an afternesse, or a seconding, and following, it may be granted; and yet to the other sense that they carry of equality, hold notwithstanding: for in order of subsisting and working (though in nature and essence not so) the Son is after, and second, and yet is God the Fathers fellow.

I grant that the word is rendred a neighbour, in *Levit. 6. 2.* and *proximus* is Englished a neighbour, and therefore I accord with *Tremelius*, who saith, the Hebrew word doth sound as much as *proximus*, a neighbour; and we know who is mans neighbour, one of the same kind, a man like himselfe, and in that respect his fellow, his equall. But who is this Lord of Hoasts neighbour? any meere man consisting onely of soul and body? Then God and man have one and the same neighbour: but it is little less then blasphemy to say, that any creature is Gods neighbour; no, it is a person of the same nature and essence

that is his neighbour, the eternall Son of God is the Fathers neighbour, was nigh him and by him from Eternity. And to be in the bosome of the Father, and at his right hand, is not a place fit for any meere creature, but fit for one equall.

But he makes two collections from the signification of the word,

1. Saith he, *Christ is the principall object of Gods dearest love : The man my fellow whom I most love, saith Grotius.*

Repl. This will be readily granted, and the other viz. coequallity not impeded nor gainsaid by it, for the Father loves his coequall better then all others ; and because he is of the same nature, and therein coequall, therfore he loves him best.

2. Saith he, *Christ is Gods principall servant in his high transactions, one that is Gods representative.*

Repl. That Christ according to his humane nature is Gods servant, is granted; but that it may be collected from this place of *Zachery* that he is Gods servant, or that the Hebrew word translated *fellow*, doth import so much, or that whole Christ is Gods servant, is denied, and is not proved by him ; but is his naked assertion.

He concludes thus :

*I might now collect from the words something
to*

to oppose the doctrine you assert, they being spoken of a man, and in reference to the Lord of Hosts, who cannot possibly have an equall, unless it were possible to have two Gods.

Repl. This man that is spoken of in the words which have been now discussed, is that Lord of Hoasts spoken of in Zech. 2.8,9,10,11. And if so, I hope one Lord of Hoasts is fellow, equall to an other Lord of Hoasts and yet it will not follow that there are two Gods, but onely two persons in the Godhead, which do fellow one another, and are equall.

The next Scripture in my paper, that I presented him with for the confirming of the undoubted truth of Christ's Godhead, was John 3.13. *No man hath ascended up into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of man, which is in heaven.*

To this Text he gives this answer, by which he would evade the omnipreience of Christ, and so not confesse him to be God.

The words (saith he) may be thus understood, No man hath ascended up into heaven, that is, no man hath known those divine things, &c. but he that came down from heaven, that is, the Son being excepted, who was in heaven, and descended thence for some works that he was to do on earth. Who is in heaven, that is, in the bosom of the Father, knowing secrets and divine things, as they are in themselves.

Repl. This interpretation is neither concordant to it selfe, nor to the truth. 1. To it selfe it agrees not, because *ascending*, and *descending*, and *existing* in relating all to heaven, are all to be taken either literally, according as the words sound, or else they are all to be taken metaphorically, and spiritually; but he expounds some of them in a mysticall figurative sense, and others in a plain literall sense. To ascend up to heaven, is not to be understood(as he gives the exposition) of a personall ascension, but of a mentall contemplation. And to be in heaven, is only in a spirituall sense, in speculation, in beholding with the eyes of the soul, divine things, and the Fathers secrets. But to descend from heaven, that must have no metaphoricall sense, as the rest had, but a literall sense put upon it, and the descension must be personall. Now here is a discordancie in these things, and he gives no reason of this varying, in his interpreting. Ascending and descending are also opposites, and if so,then they must betaken in an opposite sense; if *ascending* then be taken for deep knowledge, and science of divine things; then *descending* is departing from deep knowledge, and science of divine things; which will be very absurd in his own conceptions. 2. This exposition agrees not with the truth; for *ascending* in Scripture, is taken when it refers to Christ,

Christ, as well as when it refers to others. In another sense, *viz.* in the plain literall externall sense, *John 6. 62. What if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before.* And chap. 20.17. *I ascend unto my Father and unto your Father, &c.* And *touch me not, I am not yet ascended.* And *Ephes. 4. 8, 9, 10.* And I do not remember any one place, where ascending into heaven, is taken in his sense, but in the literall sense. And it seems to be discrepant and disagreeing to the phrase and manner of Scripture expression. For when divine knowledge and wisdome is spoken of, or other such gifts, they are said to come down from heaven, from above unto men ; and men are not said to ascend up to heaven, though there may be a truth in it, that a man ascends up to heaven, not in his knowing so much, as in the use of his knowledge, in his beholding and viewing of spirituall things.

And if a spirituall sense is not proper unto ascending into heaven, then is not Christ's being in heaven to be interpreted in a spirituall or mysticall sense ; but look in what sense he ascended and descended, in that sense it may be said he is in heaven, that is, in a literall sense ; nor is this spiritual sense of these words (*is in heaven*) agreeable to the acception of the like words, and phrase of speaking used else-where in *John 17. 24. Father, I will that these*

those whom thou hast given me, be where I am, that they may behold my glory. Christ here speaks of heaven, and of his glory in heaven, and of the disciples coming thither, and beholding his glory there ; and he speaks not in a mysticall sense, of his own knowledge of divine things, nor of the disciples knowing of such things, as he knew ; but in a literall sense he speaks all, and he saith, *I am there*, and yet he was on earth, according to his manhood: but he was in heaven also, *Where I am*, faith he, that was heaven, Christ was there. How was that possible, if Christ was not God? & if the words be taken literally there, in *Job. 17. 24* then they are literally to be taken here, in *John 3. 13*. The place discussed betwixt us, the comparing of these two places together, clears the sense of both, and is repugnant to his interpretation.

And though he gives a literall sense to these words, (*But he that came down from heaven*) viz. the Son being excepted, who was in heaven, and descended thence; yet it is a corrupt, and false, and very dangerous sense that he gives, which I met with in my former Treatise. For he represents Christ in his descension as leaving heaven, departing from thence, and coming upon earth; but this is contrary to the next expressions, the sense of which I have cleared up, where it is said, that Christ was in heaven still, notwithstanding that he de-

descended, so that it is a reall true descention, or a true coming and appearing upon earth, but not locall, such as is appliable to the creature, for that is not proper to Christ. The creature in descending moves from the place it was in, and leaves it: but 'tis not so to be conceived of Christ. But thus, Christ is said to descend in reference to his incarnation, he being the Son of God assumed flesh of the Virgine, by the divine inspiration of the Spirit of God, and so was made the Son of man, and so the Son of God, appeared in the Son of man, and this is called descending. This is made manifest to us from *John 1.14.* *The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,* even the word dwelt among us in flesh, and we beheld his glory in flesh, the glory as of the begotten Son of God. This glory was in heaven, now in the Sons assuming flesh, it is seen on earth, in the seed of the woman: this is the descending of Christ, and after this manner the most high God is said to descend in Scripture, God came into the temple after this manner, not by moving from place to place, which is not congruous to God, but by a work, declaring God to be there, where he was not seen before; And so God descended to see the tower that was built in a work, and no other way, and it is called descending after the manner of men, and it is Gods descending, all that is

is competent to God. And this kind of descending of Christ, must of necessity be yeilded unto, because the locall is excluded by Christ in the very place, where his descending is mentioned.

Having shewed the inconsistency of the exposition which he framed, and gave of this Text of *John*, and having fortified the sense in which I made use of it, and for which I produced it, I shall now answer unto that which by way of objection may be urged against the sense that I have put upon it.

Object. It may be thus argued ; A locall corporeall ascension cannot be understood in reference to Christ, because it is expressed in the preterperfect-Tense, as a thing done; but that was (in a literall locall acceptation taken) inconsistent to Christ, because he was then upon earth, and as he saith afterward, was not ascended to the Father.

Sol. The preterperfect-tense (*hath ascended*) refers to *no man*, & not to *Christ*; and there is an *Ellipsis* in the words, or a defectiveness in the expressions in reference to Christ, & therein of necessity that the words supplied should run in the preterperfect-tense: but they may run in the future tense, thus, But *he that descended, shall ascend.* viz. the Son of man which is in heaven.

Or if the words should be supplied in the preterperfect-tense, yet a change of tense
(which

(which notes out the assurance of the thing : it is spoken of as done, because assuredly it is to be done) cannot overturn the genuine sense of the place.

Obj. 2. It may be farther objected, that the son of man is the subject who is said to be in heaven ; but the son of man is Christ under the consideration of his manhood, and under that consideration it was impossible for him to be at that time in heaven, for it is contradictory to the truth of his humanity to be at two places so greatly distant at the same time.

Sol. Here is in these expressions, viz. *the son of man which is in heaven*, that which they call *Idiomatum communicationem* : that which is spoken in the concrete of Christ, according to one nature, transferred to another nature, as he himself must confess in other cases, according to his Tenant, to be often found in the Scripture ; in these words, *they would never have crucified the Lord of glory*, it is to be observed, Christ was crucified according to the flesh, but he was not the Lord of glory according to the flesh, but spirit of holiness, yet it is said, the Lord of glory was crucified : so it is said, the son of man was in heaven, but it is meant of the son of God ; and the meaning is, the person that is called the son of man, was in heaven, though not as the son of man, but according

ding to the other nature as the Son of God.

But let us try the strength of his reasons, which he brings for the countenancing of this exposition of his.

1. Saith he, *this sense and meaning where-withall I have clothed those words, is no waies opposite to the analogie of faith; There is nothing (as I suppose) in it, which the doctrine of the Gospel will pick a quarrell with.*

Repl. The nakedness of this reason is discovered in what I have already presented, I have shewed that Christ's ascending up to heaven, is not any where taken in that sense which he puts upon it. And that Christ's being in heaven in the sense that he clothes it with, is repugnant to a paralell place in Job. 17. 24. so that he makes Scripture quarrell with it selfe, and such an exposition which he hath given of Christ's descending, stands at defiance against all those pregnant places which do proclaim Christ to be coessential with the Father: therefore both Old Testament and New will rise up against it, and condemn it.

2. He saith, *That the sense that he would have this Text to own, is elsewhere challenged by the like phrases to themselves, as their due. And he mentions Prov. 30. 4. Who hath ascended up into heaven, and descended? &c.*

Repl.

Repl. Some conceive that *Agur* speaks of God in the persons of the Father and the Son, whom he describes to ascend up into heaven, and descend, to give signes of his presence in both places, and be every where ; and who gathers the winds in his fist, and binds the waters in a garment ; and that he proposeth this as an hard question to his two friends *Ithiel* and *Vcal*. Others conceive that *Agur* doth speak of man, and that his interrogation is in the force and vertue of it a negation, *Who hath ascended ? &c.* that is, no man can do such things as he mentions ; and that if his friends do know any that can effect such things, let them declare what his name is, and what his sons name is. But they all understand it of ascending to the very place of heaven ; and not any (that I have seen) in the sense that he drives at : nor doth either the text or context necessitate, that this ascending should be a discovering of Gods hidden secrets, for what then is descending ? As for *Piscator*, I have never seen him upon the *Proverbs*, and can say nothing to it.

He mentions *Paul's* rapture into the third heaven to be only a discovery of the things of God. It's somewhat presumptuous for him to determine, when the Apostle himself durst not : for, whether he was in the body, or out of the body, he could not tell. But if his rapture were

were not reall, it was in vision ; and to the third heaven and paradise he went either really or in vision ; to the place he went, that he might understand the thing.

But he quotes *Grotius*, and *Musculus*, and *Bucer*, as Writers who understand *ascend*-ing in a spirituall sense for penetrating the se-crets of heaven.

I confesse some good Expositors do so in-terpret the word *ascend* ; but how it will *qua-drare*, and what adequateness there will be betwixt the sense they give to the word *ascend*, and the sense they put upon the word *descend*, I cannot understand. However it be, the con-currence of Expositors in the interpretation of *ascending*, will avail him nothing in ref-erence to the controversie betwixt him and me ; for it lies not in that word, but in these words, *is in heaven*, whether they be literally to be un-derstood, or in respect of knowledge onely : & Expositors do not at all countenance his Me-taphoricall sense he gives of those words, but they fall upon the distinction of Natures, and say, Christ was in heaven according to the Deity, but not in heaven according to the Humanity.

3. He saith, *his sense is fitly conjoyned with the context. Christ (saith he) reproves Nicho-demus his unbelife, aggravating it from the cer-tainty of the things spoken, We speak what we know.*

know. And then from the perspicuity in speaking, If I have told you of earthly things; that is, either things that may or are necessary to be known in the earth; Or else the words respect the manner of Christ's holding them forth, And ye beleeve not; how can yee beleeve if I should tel you of heavenly things? In this 13. verse you have a exclusion of all men (Christ excepted) from the knowledge of heavenly things.

Repl. All may be granted that he saith, till he come to the 13. ver. which is more probably an explication of the 11.ver. We speak what we know, and testifie what we have seen, saith Christ. Nicodemus and others might object against the certainty of those things that Christ asserted, and might say, The judgments and wayes of the Lord are unsearchable, who hath known the mind of the Lord? Who shall ascend into heaven for us, to relate the mind of the Lord to us? Unto this Christ answers, No man hath ascended, nor can ascend up to heaven to make discovery of the will of God, of the deep things of God, but the onely begotten Son; he came from God and he ascends thither again, and he hath seen and known, and what he hath seen he declares, and testifies; and if you be not satisfied with that which the Son hath brought you from heaven, who also ascends thither again, it is an aggravation of your unbelief. And unto this coherence,

there is a concurrence of Expositors in their witnesse.

The last Scripture is now to be discussed (which he hath excepted against, and laboured to disable, that it might not speak that which I brought it to give witnesse to ; which was to justifie the deity of Christ) and it is Job.17.5. *And now, ô Father, glorifie me with thine owne selfe, With the glory I had with thee before the World was.*

He gives his gloss to these words, after this manner.

O thou Father, who dost abound in kindness, and art the Fountain of goodness, the time being come of finishing my course in earth, and returning to thy selfe, glorifie me in Heaven, (who have emptied my selfe, taking to me a naturall and mortall body, and walking among men in forme of a servant, and now being ready to humble my selfe to the death of the Cross . in obedience to thee,) with that glory which I had in Heaven before the world was, being then with thee as heir of all things, clothed with Majesty and glory, answerable to that high station wherein thy pleasure was to set me, and to that great domminion wherewithall thou wast pleased to invest me. And then he concludes, that all lyes in darkenesse which I can fetch to countenance my opinion.

Repl. He knowes what is written in Rev.

22.18,

22.18,19. in terrour to those that add to the word of God ; I wonder therefore how he dare interpose words in this prayer of Christ according to his owne fancy, and not fear and tremble.

1. He inserts these words into the preface of Christ's prayer, *Thou, O Father, who art the fountain of goodness.* And this he doth unne-cessarily, for in this prayer of Christ there is no preface at all, and why should he frame one ? this is not to interpret Scripture, but it is plainly to add to it, and it is done with a de-signe, which makes it the worse ; for he would bring Christ in , acknowledging the Father the sole fountain of goodness, excluding him-selfe , as Son of the Father , and excluding the Holy Ghost , which is a false thing, and full of injury to Christ ; who was so far from making such an acknowledgment , that he thought it not robbery to be equall with God, his assuming of equality with the Father, was not counted robbery by himselfe.

2. He inserts these words in the cloie of Christ's prayer, speaking of the glory Christ had with God, he addes these words, *answerable to that high state wherin thy pleasure was to set me, and to that great dominion wherewithall thou wast pleased to invest me.* These words, *wherin thy good pleasure was to set me, and wherewithall thou wast pleased to invest me,* are

not in the text, nor is there any thing that lookesthat way, that might give him occasion to extract them, and present them, as if there they might be found, or something like them, which will bear them; nor doth he bring any other text to make it appear, that such words are agreeable to the Analogie of faith. But by this addition he makes Christ a meere creature, a creature before he tooke flesh, before the World was, while he was with God. And he makes the glory which he had to be a derived glory, and given to Christ of meere grace, and good pleasure. Now this is most notoriously false, as I have largely and amply proved in my former Treatise. But this is the doctrine that fils his head, and fils his heart, and there is so much of this within him, that he thinks every Scripture that he lookest upon contains it, and therefore it is that he brings this Scripture, speaking that which it speakes not.

But setting aside these additions, for which he must give an account. Be it that Christs prayer had this meaning, I shall shew you what an inconsistency there is in these words to his opinion, in two or three particulars.

1. Supposing Christ (before he tooke the Seed of *Abraham* upon him) to be a created soul, made by and abiding with God, before

fore the rest of the creatures were made (for this is his opinion) how can Christ speake to God these words ? *Who have emptied my selfe, taking to me a naturall, and mortall body.*

If Christ were but a created soul, could it be an act of his will, and of his power, to take to him a body ? did ever God leave any creature at liberty to do what he will ? to chuse or refuse at his pleasure ? that he should leave Christ (this created soul as he makes him) at liberty, to take a body, or not to take it ? and if not, but that God commanded him to take it, why doth he plead it with God for reward, as if it had been done of courtesie ? Have any of the Angels, when they have waited upon men (a worke below them) had liberty to plead with God after this manner ? And how could it be an act of his power to take to him a body, he being but a created soul ? can a created soul build a body of nothing (if by creation it be ?) or build it out of a woman without the help of man (if by generation it be (as indeed it was ?) and if not, how comes Christ to plead it as some meritorious act, I have emptied my selfe in taking to me a naturall mortall body ? If God prepared him a body, why doth he say, I emptied my selfe and tooke it ? So that here is absurdity enough in this, if there were no

more in reference to his opinion, in these very words.

2. If Christ were a created soul, where was the Emptying to take a naturall and mortall body? is there not an habitude and naturall propensenesse in the soul to be in the body? is it not the soules perfection? is not the soul imperfect without it? is it any more then a part of the whole, and with the body makes a perfect man? and is this the condescension (to be presented as an high piece of selfe denyall) to be in a perfect state? And doth the soul take the body, any more then the body take the soul? or doth not God take both and unite them? here is neither Divinity nor Philosophy in this.

But it may be, this emptying was in this, that Christ a glorious soul, tooke a naturall mortall body, not a body glorified, but vile by reason of a naturall corruptibility; But 1. God prepared this body for him; where was then this excellent piece of selfe denyall, to take and accept of what God prepares, though it were an abasing to him? Saints tread in such steps of selfe denyall every day, and it is but their duty. 2. Men are and ought to be thankful to God for such naturall and mortall bodies, and for every member thereof, and Christ, if but a created soul, might well submit, yea be thankfull that his soul was not

as

as his body ; for it was of free-grace (as he faith, and I joyn with him in it, if he were a created soul). that he was so glorious a soul.

3. *Lazarus* was called (so far as concerned a naturall mortall body, and further also) to the like piece of self-denyall : for his soul was in heaven, and with God, and made perfect with God, and glorified with him ; and it must leave God, and leave heaven, and leave glory, and come into a naturall mortall body again, that must dye a second time; yea, into a sinfull tabernacle again ; and this must be done at the Command of Christ, according to the will of God. What self-denyall was this then, if Christ's was so great, when yet Christ was but only a glorified soul; And *Lazarus* which was such, yet might not *Lazarus* plead it? This is another absurdity which follows from his own words, upon his opinion : Christ being but a created soul at the first with God.

2. He makes Christ to ask of God the glory only which he had in heaven before the world was ; and indeed Christ asked no other but it. Now this is not consistent with Christs being a created soul, and a creature ; for it is manifest from the Scripture, yea, it is confess by himselfe in many places of his printed paper, That Christ as a creature had greater glory by donation, after his sufferings, after

his deep humiliation, then ever he had as a creature before; for that Heirship of all things, and dominion, and principality, and height above all principality, and that name above every name, was the reward which God bestowed upon him in reference to the crosse which he bore; and it was his highest glory as a creature; therefore it is expressed in these words, *is made both Lord and Christ*; not restored to what he had, but made: and what a rewarding is that, only to restore him to what he had at first? Therefore seeing that Christ prayes here in *John* for the glory that he had with God before the world was, and asked no more; and seeing it is as evident, that as a creature his greatest glory was not before his sufferings, but after, and was the reward of his sufferings; it will necessarily follow, that he prayes for divine glory to be restored, and that as a creature he was not with God before the world was, nor had glory as a creature.

3. He saith, and the Text saith, that the glory that Christ asked of his Father, was the glory before the world was, but the glory which Christ had as a creature, could not be the glory before the world was; for he himself confesseth, that that glory which he had as a creature, consisted in heirship and dominion over the world; but this heirship and dominion over the world, was not, nor could be

be before the world was: it will therefore follow, that either Christ was created without glory, and had no glory till the world was created, which is directly contradictory to the Text; or if he had a glory, it was not any created glory, for that consisted in dominion, which was not til the world was; and then what glory could it be, but that which we contend for, divine uncreated glory, which holds forth him to be an uncreated and eternal being; and by consequence to be the most high God?

But he brings reasons for his own tenent, that whole Christ is a creature, from this Text of John, and attempts the overthrow of my assertion of Christs Deity, which I contend for from this Text.

1. Saith he, *If Christ were equal with the Father, why doth Christ direct his prayer to his Father? There had been no need, nor can cause be shewed, why he should supplicate to his Father, and not act reliance on the Godhead.*

Repl. I have rendred reasons for it in my former Treatise, in my reply to his fist argument, which was this, *He that acteth with dependance on another, is a creature, but whole Christ acteth with dependance.* To which I referre the reader, because it is largely discussed there; and it is a tedious unpleasing thing to mul-

multiply repetitions, though he delights himselfe too much therein : yet lest that Treatise should not be at hand, I shall satisfie the Reader thus far. It behooved the Godhead in the person of the Son to be veyled, for this was the Sons emptying of himselfe; but not so the Godhead in the person of the Father ; therefore the Son acts not dependance upon the Godhead that dwelt in himself in the person of the Son, or as it was in himself, but as it was in the Father.

2. He saith, *We do not use to pray, but praise for things we have, if we know that we have them.* Now Christ could not want the highest glory in any sense, if he were a person in the Trinity, coequall with the Father, especially not be without it, with the Father, nor in heaven in any sense whatsoever, as by the clouding, darkning, or obscuring of it ; therefore the glory which he had with the Father, was not the highest glory, but a glory proceeding from the highest ; and by consequence, Christ was but a creature.

Repl. It is true, that the highest glory (he being a person in the Trinity coequall with the Father) could not be separated from him, for it follows the divine essence, and cannot be divided from it ; but it might be, and indeed was obscured, and clouded, not to the Father,

Father, nor to the Son himselfe ; for the Father saw it, and gave witnesse to it, and so did the Son, and comprehended it fully : but to the creature it was darkned and obscured, and but some small beams and rayes of it appeared ; the Son was incarnate, or in flesh, but the glory of the Son appeared not in flesh in fulnesse of lustre, like the glory of the Son ; but the form of God in the Son was veyled and hidden in the form of a servant ; Now Christ prayes that that essentiall divine glory might be manifested in flesh, that he the Son in flesh might appear in glory, when he should come to heaven, as he did before he took flesh ; that as the Godhead was hidden in the manhood, so the manhood might be glorified with the Godhead, that the flesh might be taken up into the fellowship of the glory of the Divinity, by the shining forth and breaking out of the glory of the Divinity in the flesh.

3. It appears (saith he) that the glory which he had with the Father was not divine, or the highest glory, because it was to be commnnicated. Glorifie me, O Father, with that glory, &c. Now the highest glory being infinite, could not be given or communicated to the humane nature, which was finite, and so uncapable of it, &c.

Repl. Though the divine glory cannot be com-

communicated to humane nature, so as that it should be inherent in the humane nature; yet it may gloriously shine forth upon it, and appear in it, which it did not before: yea by reason of the hypostaticall union betwixt the divine nature and the humane nature, the glory of the divine nature becomes the glory of the whole person, so as that when the glory of the Son shines forth in its greatest strength in the flesh, it may be predicated and asserted of the man Christ, that he is glorified with the glory which the Son had with the Father before the world was ; Because the man Christ is the same person with the eternall Son of God.

Thus all the Scriptures which I drew witness to, that Jesus Christ is the true God, and the most high God, notwithstanding all his endeavours to suffocate their testimony, and his attempts by violence to silence them, that they should not speak what they would speak, yet they have with open mouth, with one consent, given glory unto Christ, by witnessing to his Godhead, and to his coessentialness, and to his coequality with the Father.

I shall conclude my Vindication of them with these words, *Let God be true in what he hath testified of his Son in Scripture,*
and

*and every man that opposeth let him be a
lyer.*

My next undertaking must be the defence of the Arguments which I produced , and drew up from Scripture , by which I attempted to prove the destructiveness of the Doctrine which he holds (making whole Christ a creature) to the true Gospel, and opposite-ness of it to the Scripture in many main points and truths of it.

My Assertion was, That the doctrine which makes Christ a meer creature , brings in (as it were) another Gospel, and destroyes the true Gospel in many parts thereof ; and brings in another Scripture in many main points.

He calls this a reason against his doctrine of Christ a meere creature ; and so it is, not onely to shew the falsenesse of such doctrine, but also to discover the horridnesse and hideousnes of the doctrine, that all might be warned of it, and with fear and trembling may decline it.

But he wisheth him to be *Anathema* that holds any such doctrine, that destroys the Gospel or the Scripture, and falls upon the examination of the instances or Arguments which I produced to confirme that generall reason.

Therefore

Therefore because he is so confident, that his doctrine will not prove such; and because he hath possessed the people, that though there should be a mistake in it on his part, yet it is not so dangerous as I would make it; and that the salvation of mens soules is not so nearly concerned in it, as I would have men to conceive; and that Christ is never a whit less a sufficient Saviour, though but a creature; and that it is enough to beleeve unto salvation that Christ is Lord, *viz. made Lord*; and that God raised him from the dead; by which means persons have become lesse solicitous what doctrine they entertain, they see it hath a specious shew, and conceive it will not prove destructive, though it should prove false; therefore I think it expedient to fortifie my position, which respects the oppositionesse of this doctrine of his, both to the Gospel, and the testimony of other Scriptures, with some further proofes, not purposing at all to desert my former grounds, (which I confide in as much as ever) but intending in my following discourse to free them from his evasions, by which he would elude the strength of them.

And thus I argue:

Arg. 1. That doctrine that denyes and destroys that one onely true God, and brings

brings in a strange and a false God, that Doctrine destroyes the true Gospel and Scriptures, and brings in another Gospel and Scriptures : But this Doctrine of his, that makes whole Christ a creature, doth so : Therefore, &c.

The Major admits of no doubt, because the Scripture is clear, that there is *but one onely true God*, Deut.6.4. 1 Cor. 8.6.

The Minor must have proof, and thus I confirm it : If the one onely true God be both three and one, three in Persons, and one in Essence ; be Father, Son, and Spirit, which are called three, and yet are but one ; then that Doctrine which makes God to be but one and one, *viz.* one in person, and one in essence, and makes the Father onely to be God, excluding the Son and Spirit, denies and destroyes the true God, and sets up a false God.

My proof for the Minor again (for the Major is unquestionable) is 1 Joh.5.7,9. There are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one.

What will he answer to this Scripture ?

He will not deny, but that the three that are here spoken of, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit,

Spirit are three persons, (for he hath granted it all along in his discourse, that they are three distinct persons) but the oneness of these three in essence, is that which he denyes ; that they are one God, is not yeilded by him ; because the words *ἐν εἷσι* are not found in one copy of the Greek ; But this answer may be given, that in all other copies these words are found, which renders that copy, where they are wanting, suspicious, and the 9. *verse* makes it manifest that it is so ; for the three witnesses in the 7. *ver.* are called the witness of one God in *ver. 9.* if we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater ; what witness of God is this ? it is the witness of the three that was spoken of in *ver. 7.* which are said to be but one God. And it is observable, that the three witnesses on earth, are said to agree in one, *ver. 8.* but those in heaven to be one : it is *ἐν εἷσι* in *ver. 7.* and *εἰς τὸ ἐν εἷσι* in *ver. 8.* in all the most approved copies, which the concurrence of *ver. 9.* with *ver. 7.* justifies, as was said before.

However it be, there is strength enough in this argument to them that grant the Godhead of Christ ; they must confess whether they will or no, that the true God is denied, and a false God brought in : for if the Father

ther be God, and the Son be God, and the Son be not the Father, nor the Father the Son: and yet there be not two Gods, but one God; then this one God is the Father and Son, (I do not exclude the Spirit, but I speak to those who acknowledge Father and Son both of them to be God) they must confess that they are both of them but one and the same God; and then it comes to this, that the true God is one in two, and it is two in one, according to their tenent, that is, one God in essence, and twō in persons, or two persons in one essence: the consequence of which is this , they must conclude, that whoever makes the essence to be one, and the person to be but one, the Father to be God, and he alone to be God, and the Son not to be God, much less the holy Ghost, such an one brings in a strange God, and unscripturall God, destroyes the true God which is Father and Son,as themselves acknowledg,yea and Spirit also,as they will not deny. And how then can any such person make the denying of Christ to be God a triviall error, nor greatly consequential,nor of such moment, as to be so greatly contended for ? not fundamentall nor damnable, though per-

I listed

sisted in? when as yet it is the denying of the onely God, which is not Father alone, but Father, Son and Spirit.

But why should I contest with friends, which confesse the Diety of Christ? I am sorry there should be any occasion, I will turn again upon the adversary.

Either Father and Son (I exclude not the Spirit, but I am pleading the Sons God-head, and not the Spirits, and shewing the heinousness of the errorre of denying it) I say either the Father and the Son are the onely God, or else there is no God at all, for the Scripture saith *Joh. 10. 30* *that the Father and Christ are one in power,* which is an essentiall attribute, and then they are one in essence, and so one God; and yet they are two distinct persons. *Joh. 8.17. 18.* *It is written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true, I am one that bear witness of my self, and my Father beareth witness of me.* If the Father and the Son be two distinct witnesses, then they two are distinct persons; for none can be witnesses but persons; and two manifestati-ons of the same person cannot be said to be two distinct witnesses; nor would the proof which is fetcht from the law (where the witnesses were distinct persons) be suitable

table. But he will confess this, that the Father and Son are distinct persons, and distinct witnesses also : and if so, he cannot with any face deny the other, that they are one, as well as two, because Christ saith so in the above named place; one, *viz.* in power, in essence, in Godhead. And indeed, the very context (where they are called two witnesses) will witness that they are but one God. the Jews reject his witness of himself, such as they took him to be, which was a meer man (for the law alowed it not that any man should be admitted to bear witness of himself;) but he notwithstanding bears himself out by the law, to be an adequate witness of himself; but herein he hath recourse to that of himself, which they saw not, which they knew not, as ver. 14. shewes, *I know whence I came, ye cannot tell whence I came.* He could not mean it of his soul, for they could not look upon him without a soul, and soul and body made but one man; and notwithstanding both, he would be an unadequate witness of himself: But he means another thing, distinct both from soul and body, and from his manhood; which might be a witness of him as man, and this could be nothing

but his Godhead and he joynes himself (according to this) with the Father, as a distinct witness, but the same God. The result is then, that the one true *God*, though but one in essence, yet is not one single person, but subsists in a plurality of persons. Therefore he that makes his substance to be single, and such as his essence is, denies and destroyes this one onely *God*. Which I prove further.

The Father is said to be *the onely true God*, *John* 17.3. and the Son is called the *true God*, *1 John* 5.20. This Adjective [*onely*] refers not to the subject person *Father*, but refers to the predicate or thing that the Father is said to be, *viz.* *the true God*; which is but *onely* one, which is clear from a paralell place in *Jer.22.30.* where the word *onely* is used in like manner, the children of Israel and *Judah* have *onely done evill*, *have onely provoked me*, The word *onely* is not to be applyed to the subject persons spoken of, as if they *onely*, and no other people had done evill, and provoked God; but it is to be applyed to the thing that is spoken of them, *they have only done evill, and onely provoked*; that is, *they have done nothing else but evill, nothing else but provoke*;

vokē; so in *John*, the Father is said to be the one only true God, but not he only to be the true God; for the Son is calied the true *God* as wel as he, in the place before named in *I Job.* 5. 20. Whence I argue, that the one only true God is Father and Son. (as for the holy Ghost, I always include him though I have not occasion to speak of him here:) & there is no God, no true God, but that God that is Father and Son ; and he that denys either of these, denyes this one onely true *God*. He then that acknowledgeth the person of the Father to be *God*, but acknowledgeth not the person of the Son to be *God*, brings in a strange *God*, an unscripturall *God*, and a false *God*. For there is no such *God* as subsists in the person of the Father onely ; and hence it is that the Apostle *John* saith, *I John* 2. 22, 23. he is an Antichrist that denyeth the Father and the Son : And he that denyeth the Son, denyeth the Father also ; that is, such an one acknowledgeth not the true *God* at all, what-ever men may think of him.

Yet further, the Father is called the *only God*, *Job.* 17. 3. & *Christ* is calid the *only God*, *Jud.* 4, 24, 25. But some think otherwise, that the Father, and not *Christ* is called the *only God*, and that *Jude* speaks in *ver. 4.* of

Jesus Christ afterwards, as distinct from the *onely God*: but that it is otherwise I prove first from the right translation of the Greek; $\chi\tau\tau\delta\mu\nu\rho\nu\Theta\acute{e}\o\nu\chi\tau\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\tau\nu\tau\kappa\acute{e}\nu\acute{e}\o\nu$. that is, denying the *onely God and Master, the Lord Jesus Christ*. It is not said the *onely God and the Master* (with an article) the Lord Jesus Christ; for then he had spoken of two persons that they denyed, *viz.* the *onely God*, (that is one) and the *Master*, the *Lord Jesus Christ* (that is another:) but it is said, *the onely God and Master, the Lord Jesus Christ*, as speaking of one person, only which is *Christ*. 2. From the concordance betwixt this Scripture, and that in 2 Pet. 2.1. They are paralell in three particulars, 1. In the title that is put upon Christ in both places, he is called *Acacōtēns*, which in both places is translated in our Bibles, *Lord*; but is rather to be turned *Master*. 2. The crime and fault that is charged upon them is the same, it is *denying their Lord, or their Master*. 3. The persons seeme to be the same in both places, for they are in all things described alike, *false Teachers* in one place, *filthy dreamers* in the other place: *they privily come in and act and worke in the*

the one place, they creep in at unawares in the other place. They walke after the flesh, and despise government in one place, They defile the flesh, despise dominion in the other place. Their judgement of long time lingeþ not, and their damnation slumbreþ not, in one place; and they were before of old ordained to condemnation in the other place. Their ruine is set forth by the punishment which God inflicted upon the Angells that fell, and upon the old world, and upon Sodom and Gomorrah in one place; and in the other place by the Children of Iisrael that fell in the Wildernesse by unbelief, and by the Apostate Angells, and by Sodom and Gomorrah and the Cities about them. So that it seems to be one and the same Prophecie wherewith both Peter and Jude were inspired, and which they have left upon record for the benefit of the Church: Therefore the one must help to expound the other: the crime then of denying (which both the Apostles speake of) hath the same object, viz. Jesus Christ, and not the Father: it is clear that Christ alone is the object of that wicked act of those spoken of in Peter; therefore Christ alone and not the Father, is the object of the same wicked act spoken of in Jude.

And indeed there were never any Christian Teachers, (and of such both the Apostles speake) that did deny the Father to be God, but the Son Jesus Christ was denied by many. And if we make a serious inspection into verse 25. of *Jude*, and compare it with the precedent *verse*, we shall find that Christ is spoken of, and not the Father ; and if so, then Christ is called the *onely wise God* ; for it is the same person that presents saints faultless before the presence of his glory, who is called the *onely wise God*. But who is that ? The Apostle *Paul* declares who he is in *Eph.5.* 27. it is Christ, who is described to give himselfe for the *Chuch*, and to have washed it with his owne blood, that he may present it a glorious *Church* to himselfe.

Whence I thus Argue, If the Father be the *only God*, and if the Son be also the *only God*, and yet there are not two *only Gods*, but one *onely God*, then this one *onely God* is both Father and Son ; that is, this one *onely God*, though but one in essence, yet is two at least in persons (but indeed is three, but that is somewhat beside my undertaking;) and then it will follow, that that God where an unity *only* is granted, both in essence and personality,

nality, is not the onely God, which the Gospel and other Scriptures hold out, and consequently is a false God: for I would ask this question, suppose a person should acknowledge Christ to be the on-
ly God, and should deny the Father to be God, could this man be said to ac-
knowledge the one onely true God which the Scriptures speak of? I suppose none will be so absurd as to assert it, therefore if Christ be the onely God as the Father is, he that acknowledgeth the Father without him, acknowledgeth not the on-
ly true God ; and so is guilty of destroy-
ing the Scriptures, and bringing in ano-
ther Scripture in a maine fundamental
point of it.

Ar. 2. But for further satisfaction, I shall propound a 2^d Argument, which is this; That doctrine which denyes and destroys that one only true Christ, and brings in a strange and a false Christ, that doctrine destroys the true Gospell and Scriptures, and brings in another Gospell and Scripture in a main point of it. But this doctrine of his which makes Christ a crea-
ture doth thus: therefore this doctrine brings in another Gospell and Scripture in a main point of it.

The

The Major is so void of controversie, that it will not be stuck at; but the Minor will be denied, and therefore must be confirmed.

That doctrine that denyes Christ to be the proper Son of God, and makes Christ to be onely the Son of man, that doctrine denyes and destroyes that one only true Christ, and brings in a strange and a false Christ; but this doctrine of his doth thus; therefore this doctrine of his denyes and destroyes that onely true Christ, and brings in a false Christ, and strange to Scripture.

The Major will again passe without exception, but proofe will be required for the Minor; And I confirme it thus.

That doctrine which takes Christs God-head from him, that doctrine denies Christ to be the proper Son of God, and makes him to be meerly the son of man: But this doctrine of his which makes Christ to be a meere creature, and nothing more, takes Christs God-head from him. Therefore this doctrine of his denyes him to be the proper Son of God, and makes him to be meerely and only the son of man.

The Major wil now only be in question; for

for the Minor is (without question) true, if *God-head* be taken in a proper sense, as I have taken it in my arguing with him all along.

For the prooфе then of the Major proposition, I shall present and make out two things, 1. that these two things *God*, and *Son of God* are all one in reference to Christ ; therefore whoever teacheth any doctrine against the one, *viz.* that Christ is *not God*, teacheth doctrine against the other, *viz.* that Christ is *not the Son of God*. 2. Christ cannot be God any other way ; or under any other consideration, but as he is the *Son of God*.

1. *God* and *Son of God* are all one thing in reference to Christ : my meaning is not that the termes are confounded, for the word (*God*) respects the essence, more properly and subsisting in a person ; and the words (*Son of God*) respect the second person in the Trinity , as distinguished from the Father, and the holy Ghost subsisting in the Godhead. But my meaning is, that where ever the one is expressed, the other is implied, and that a divine person subsisting in the Godhead is meant evermore ; and in the order of existing and working, the second person; for prooфе
of

of this, consider these following particulars.

I. Christ himself confounds these two, *God, and Son of God*, by using them promiscuously, *John 10. 33. 36*. In ver. 33. the Jewes said they stoned him because he *blasphemed, and said he was God*; Christ repeats their words, and blames them for charging him with blasphemie, *because he said he was the Son of God*, ver. 36. those were not their expressions, but Christ makes them their expressions, therefore in a sense they were one and the same thing, and *Son of God*, was as much as *God*, else Christ had both extenuated their fault, & spoken untruly of them. But in truth and deed Christ said of himself neither the one nor the other in express words, but said, *he and his Father were one*, ver. 30. and if the *Son of God* did not import as much as *God*, their collection in their own words that he made himselfe *God*, in making himselfe one with the Father, was more naturall in reference to Christ's words, then as Christ repeated them. For the Father is *God*, and not the *Son of God*, and when Christ said, *he and his Father were one*, they might rather conclude that Christ made himselfe *God*, then that he made

made himself *the Son of God*, unless the Son of God were also *God*, and so Christ might be the Son of God, and yet one in Godhead with the Father.

2. The Apostle *John*, I Joh. 5.20. makes *the Son of God* and *the true God* to be all one in reference to Christ, *You are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ:* and this *true one*, this *Son Jesus Christ*, this very person, *is the true God*. As if the Apostle should have said, when I speak of the Son of God, I would have you to know whom I mean by him, I do not mean a man, a meer creature, and nothing else, but I mean a person that is the true God.

3. The Apostles in their professions of faith, if they do agree therein, (and I suppose none will say that they do disagree therein) do make these two to be one and the same thing. The Apostle *Peter* professeth his faith in these words, *I believe that thou art Christ the Son of the living God*. But the Apostle *Thomas* in these words, *My Lord, and my God*. *Peter* beleeved him to be *the Son of God*, *Thomas* beleeved him to be *very God*, and *very Lord*, yea *his God and his Lord* in an applicative way; and Christ doth not

not look upon one as two low for him, nor upon the other as too high for him; but upon both as professions of their true faith in him; he tells *Peter*, that upon the rock of such a profession he would build his Church; and he puts a blessing upon all those that shall beleieve as *Thomas* beleaved, his slowness only to beleieve (depending upon sight) excepted.

4. The grounds whereupon the followers of Christ have some of them stiled him *the Son of God*, and others of them have stiled him *God*, are alike, and high enough (all of them) to cause them to entitle him *God*. *Nathaneel* sees his omnipresence and omniscience, when Christ told him, *before Philip called thee, I saw thee under the fig tree*, and he glorifies him with the title of *Son of God*, *Thou art the Son of God*. *Thomas* discerns his omnipotence in raising himself from the dead, according as he had foretold, *destroy this temple, and I will raise it up in three dayes*: and he attributes the name of *God* to him, *My Lord, and my God*. Had *Thomas* apprehended Christ to have been passive in the resurrection, and raised merely by the power of the Father, and not his own, why should he denominate him *God* upon this occa-

occasion ? and not rather put that crown upon the Father, that raised him; if the Father only, and not the Son, wrought in it ?

5. The high Priests, and Scribes, and Pharisees thought it to be blasphemy alike in Christ when he made himself the Son of God, and made God his natural Father, as when he made himself God ; as they truly collected from those words of his, *I and my Father are one.* Compare *Job.5.18.* with *Job.10.31,33.* and the truth of this will appear. And they made account when he stiled himself *the Son of God,* that he therein assumed to himself equality with God, *Job.5.18.* and in that they counted it blasphemy that he called himself *the Son of God,* and judged him worthy to die for it, they discovered their apprehensions of that title, that it was too high for any creature, and proper to the most high God alone.

6. Satan also in tempting of him, requires a proof of his son-ship unto God, equall and equivalent to what he could demand for the manifestation of the very God-head it self: and he must declare himself to be the Son of God, by doing that which none but God could do.

These grounds I conceive are sufficient to bottom the first conclusion upon, viz. that these two expressions or titles, *Son of God,*

God, and God are in Scripture account equivalent to each other, and do import when they are applyed to Christ a divine person, and the second in the order of the Trinity. The consequence of which is, that who ever denies the one, denies the other also ; and then if the *God-head* of Christ be denied, the Son-ship of Christ will be denied also.

I shall now lay downe the 2^d position, and confirme it.

2 Christ cannot be God any other way or under any other consideration, but as he is the Son of God.

1 He himselfe, in his sense, acknowledgeth the truth of this assertion; for, he grants a *God-head* of Christ, and makes him a representative God, and saith, his *God-head* consists in soveraignty, and dominion over all the creatures: and he founds it upon Son-ship, and saith, the title *Son of God* holds forth superiority over all things, and so he is God in that he is the Son of God; but all amounts to no more but a creature God, and a creature Son of God, according to him. Yet he concurrs with me in this proposition, though in a different sense, Christ cannot be God any other way then as he is the Son of God.

2. Scrip-

2. Scripture gives testimony to it. 1. The Apostle *Paul* declares to us that *God was manifested in the flesh.* 1 Tim. 3.16. that is, God assumed the flesh of the Virgin ; God took the seed of *Abraham* ; God united our Nature with the Divine Nature ; God took it into fellowship and oneness with himself, so as that God and man became one and the same person. And this the Apostle calls *a great mystery*, and founds all godliness upon it, that is, upon knowing it, and believing it. And so Christ comes to be God, hath the Names, Titles, Attributes of God put upon him ; and the great works of God are called his works ; and the homage, worship, service, faith, fear, and obedience that is due to God, belongs to him. Otherwile it could not have been, that he that appeared in the form of a servant , and was in fashion as a man, and dwelt among us, and whose mother was known who she was, and was in all things like unto us, sin excepted , should be the God that made us, and he in whom our life and breath, and all our ways are : but so it was, that the great God emptied himself, so far, as to unite himself to us , or us rather to himself, and to dwell in our nature , and made our nature to dwell in him; and so he became one with us, and made us, that is, our Nature, one with him : And so the Son of *Mary* is very God, the most high God, because God descended , and was made flesh of a woman.

2. There is a concurrence of witnesses in the sacred Scriptures, that God took flesh ; but not God in the

person of the Father, nor God in the person of the Spirit, but God in the person of the Son : *Joh. i. 14.*
The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and this *Word* is neither the Father, nor the holy Ghost, but is distinguished from both, *i Joh. 5.7.* *There are three that bear witness in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these three are one;* that is, one God. But this one God, in the person of the Word, and not in any other person, took flesh upon him. The Father did not take Flesh, but sent the Son to assume it : *Gal. 4.4.* *God, that is, the Father, sent forth his Son made of a woman.* *Joh. 3. 16.* *God,* that is, the Father, *so loved the world that he gave his own Son, his only begotten Son, &c.* And all along in the new Testament, the Son is said to be *sent*, sometimes from God, sometimes from the Father, sometimes from heaven: And of the Son it is said in *Heb. 2. 14*, that *he took part of flesh and blood:* and ver. 6. *He took on him the seed of Abraham:* and of the Son it is said, that *he was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God,* that is, with the Father ; *but he humbled himself, and took upon him the form of a servant;* that is, he took upon him our vile, weak, mortal, dying nature, and came in lowe state among us. And indeed, in this there is no difference betwixt us : But who this Son of God is, is the controversie.

The inference then must needs be this, that Christ is not God any other way, nor in any other fence, but this : The Son of God, or (which is all one) God in the

person of the Son assumed Humane nature unto him, became Man, by taking the flesh of the Virgin. And this Son of God, or God in the person of the Son made flesh, is the Christ, the Messiah, that was promised to the fathers: And Christ, he is this flesh, this seed of the woman, assumed, and this Son of God, or God in the person of the Son, united together into one person. So that whoever denies Christ to be God, denies that God in the person of the Son, or (which is the same) that the Son of God took flesh, came in our Nature; and that God sent his Son into the world, to take the seed of *Abraham* upon him, and to come in flesh; and so denies Christ to be God in the person of the Son, or Christ to be the Son of God. And so by an undeniable consequence, such a person who denies the Godhead, denies the Sonship, and so destroys the true Christ, and brings in a strange and a false Christ, and another Gospel, and another Scripture. And this is the doctrine that the Apostle *John* speaks of, 2 *Joh.* 7. which seducers preached, who confessed not that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh: the meaning is they confessed not that the Son of God or God in the person of the Son, was come in the flesh: for otherwise they knew that Jesus Christ the son of *Mary* was in the flesh, and died, and rose again: But to confess that Jesus was the Son of God, or God in the person of the Son, was that which the Apostle professed; and withheld the contrary, as Antichristian, 1 *Joh.* 4.14,15.

And now give me leave to express my self to

be one who stand amazed at the ignorance or inconsiderateness (or I know not what to call it) of those persons who profess to be very sound in the doctrine of Christs Godhead, but conceive of it as a very tolerable error, in such who do deny it, and make slight of it. Is it a small thing to deny Christ to be the Son of God? Those that deny Christs Godhead, do deny God in the person of the Son, to have taken the nature of man upon him: or, they do deny the Son of God to be incarnate, and by consequence they do deny Christ to be Gods Son. For do they not know, (I speak of those that have not denied the Faith) if Christ be God, he can be God no other way, but because God in the person of the Son, or the Son of God, took flesh upon him: if Christ be Gods Son, he can be Gods Son no other way, but because God in the person of the Son hath come in the flesh; and if this be denied, it is denied that Christ is Gods Son. And is this a trivial matter? Christ consists of two Natures; of Humanity, and so he is the Son of man; of the Deity, and so he is the Son of God, as I have shewed. Can Christ be a true Christ, if either of these be wanting? A Man consists of soul and body: if either of these be wanting, can he be a true man? If the soul be wanting, (which is the principal part) is he any more then a stinking carcase?) If Christ be not the Son of God, (as, if he be not God, he is not) is he any other but a carcase-Christ? Can a thing have its truth of being, without its constitutive parts by which it is? So that Christ is destroyed, unless

unless the Son of God, and the Son of Man, united together in one person, be maintained.

I now come to present and drive on a third Argument, which is this :

Arg. 3. That Doctrine which destroys the true Faith of Christians, and brings in another Faith, a strange and false Faith ; that Doctrine destroys the true Gospel and Scripture, and brings in another Gospel and Scripture, in a main Point.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes Christ a creature, doth so :

Therefore, this Doctrine of his destroys the true Gospel and Scripture, and brings in another and a false Gospel and Scripture.

The Major is indubitable ; the Minor may be thus proved :

That Doctrine which takes away the principal object of a Christians Faith, doth destroy the true Faith of a Christian.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes Christ a mere creature, doth take away the principal object of the Faith of a Christian :

Therefore, this Doctrine of his doth destroy the Faith of a Christian.

The Major cannot reasonably be denied, because Faith is true and saving from the object that it is conversant about ; as suppose it should be *Baal* in stead of the true God ; suppose it should be *Mahomet* in stead of Christ ; or suppose it should be a false or counterfeit Christ, in stead of the true Christ : that

faith that is carried out to such an object, could neither be true nor saving.

The Minor may be thus confirmed :

That Doctrine that denies Christ to be the Son of God, takes away the principal object of the faith of Christians.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature doth deny Christ to be the Son of God : Therefore, this Doctrine takes away the principal object of the faith of Christians.

The Major hath an infallible truth in it : for the Scripture makes Christ to be principally the object of a Christians faith, as he is the Son of God. 1. It hath its denomination from this object ; it is called *the faith of the Son of God* Gal.2.20. 2. Christ propoileth himself, as he is the Son of God, to be believed on : so to the blinde man (whose eyes he had opened) *Dost thou believe the Son of God*, said Christ ? Joh.9.35. Under that consideration, as such a person he presented himself as an adequate object of his faith for salvation. 3. The primitive Saints mentioned in Scripture, in their Confessions of Faith, do point their Faith, and terminate it upon Christ, the Son of God. In Joh. 11. 27, Martha said, *Lord, I believe that thou art Christ the Son of God.* The Eunuch also being put upon the declaration of his faith, did pitch it upon, and carried it out to this object, *Acts 8.37. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* It should seem that Philip had held him forth in the excellency and glory of his

his person *as the Son of God*, and had preached him under that relation as the object of saving faith, and that thereupon the Eunuch received him as such, and believed. But before these, the Apostles themselves, that were bred up under Christ, and were instructed by Christ, they grounded their faith upon Christ as he was the Son of the living God, in *Joh.6.69.* *We believe and are sure that thou art Christ the Son of the living God.* 4. Christ makes himself, as he is *the Son of God*, the foundation of Christians, upon which their faith must bottom; and this Article of Faith, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*, he makes the Rock upon which he will build his *Church*; and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it, *Matth.16.16.* And he placeth true blessedness in it. I could wish that all persons that are right in their opinion of Christ's Godhead, and yet plead against the fundamentalness of the error of denying the Godhead, would but ponder what is here presented, and take it up in its full weight and strength. They that hold Christ to be God, must needs do it upon this account, because God in the person of the Son, or the Son of God, which is the second person in the Trinity, took flesh upon him, and became man; and that hence it is that this man, and this second person in the Godhead, or this Son of God, make up one Christ, and that Christ is hereupon justly styled *the Son of God*, or *the second person in the Godhead*. And if it be also clear from Scripture, that faith in Christ is onely sound and saving, as it

hath Christ considered as he is the Son of God , or the second person in the Godhead , for the object of it ; then what can that Doctrine be less then destructively dangerous , and subverting the very foundation of Christianity , that denies that there is any such God in the person of the Son , or any such second person in the Godhead called the Son , or that there is any such Son of God , who is God ; such persons consequently cannot have their Faith carried out after any such Son of God , who is God ; but after a Creature-son of God , which is totally another thing from that Son of God which Scripture presents to us : And what can be thought of those that hold such Doctrine , but that they have left the Rock , the Foundation upon which Believers are built unto the salvation of their souls ; and that they build upon the sand , and that their state threatens certain ruin ?

But the Minor will be that Proposition which he will deny ; viz. That this Doctrine of his which makes whole Christ a creature , doth deny Christ to be the Son of God .

I have proved this Proposition in my prosecution of the former Argument ; to which I might refer the Reader : but for further satisfaction I shall make choice of another *medium* , and by it prove that this his Doctrine denies Christ to be the Son of God .

That Doctrine that makes Christ a creature-son of God , denies Christ to be the true Son of God . But this Doctrine of his makes Christ to be onely a creature-son of God :

There-

Therefore this Doctrine of his denies Christ to be the true Son of God.

The Major Proposition is that which will onely be denied by him; therefore I shall prove out of Scripture, that Christ cannot be a creature-son of God.

1. The eternal Son of God cannot be a creature-son of God, because no creature is eternal. Or thus :

That Son of God that hath neither *beginning of days, nor end of life*, cannot be a creature-son of God, because it is the most high God's property to be without beginning or ending.

But Christ is such a Son of God, which is without beginning of days, and hath no end of life ; which is evident from *Heb.7.3.* *Melchizedek* is described to have neither *beginning of days, nor end of life* ; and therein (as a type onely) to be like the Son of God, or like Christ as he is the Son of God : by which it appears, that Christ is such a Son of God as is truely eternal, without beginning or ending. For it behoves that which is the Antitype, or the thing typified, to be that in truth, which the Type is in shadow. *Melchizedek* was in figure and in mysterie without beginning of days and end of life ; Christ must therefore really and truely be without beginning and end, because he, as the Son of God, was the person whom *Melchizedek* typified herein.

Therefore, he is no creature-son of God.

2. The Almighty Son of God cannot be a creature-
son of God, because *Almighty* is one of the
most high God's incommunicable attributes.

But Christ is such a Son of God as is Almighty :
Therefore, no creature-son of God.

That Christ is such a Son of God as is God Almighty, will be proved from Scripture. In *Mat. 14. 32. 33*, considered with the context, the windes were boisterous and tempestuous : by the vertue and power of Christ, (which was inherent in him, and which he was the subject of) they ceased. Hereupon, the disciples all of them worshipped him, and confessed that he was the Son of God, that is, one Almighty, whom the windes and the sea obeyed ; and this they made to be the Son of God : for they apprehended the Son of God to be such an one who was cloathed with such power. So in *Job. 1. 33, 34*, *John* knew not Christ who he was ; but the Father told him that he *on whom the holy Ghost should descend, should baptize with the holy Ghost*. Hence *John* collected, that he was the Son of God ; and the text saith, *he bare record of it*. God had not told him so, but onely that *he should baptize with the holy Ghost* ; but he thence collected so much. But how could that be, seeing the disciples baptized with the holy Ghost ; and yet it could not be collected that they were each of them the Son of God in the sence that *John* bare record of Christ, that he was the Son of God ? It must be conceived then, that *John* looked upon Christ as one in whom the power was inherent

rent to baptize with the holy Ghost , and that he argued after this manner. He in whom the vertue is to baptize with the holy Ghost ; that is , he who hath the power of enabling men to speak with strange tongues , and to prophesie , and to work miraculously , he must needs be the Son of God. But Christ is such an one : Therefore , he is the Son of God. The Son of God which *John* speaks of , is therefore an Almighty Son of God , and no creature , because he can do such a thing , that requireth an Almighty power. In like manner we may read in *Job.* 5. 25. Christ saith , that *the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God , and that they that hear it shall live.* This Son of God then can be no creature , because the dead in any fence cannot hear the voice of a creature. It is not to be denied , but that men have raised the dead , in what fence soever it may be taken , who are but creatures : but it was not the outward voice which raised them , and which they heard , which external voice is the creatures voice ; but it was the power that they felt , which was God's , which is called the *voice behinde them* , or within them , and is nothing but the power of God in working upon them , *Isa. 30.21.* But the voice by the force of which these dead which Christ speaks of were to be raised , was the voice of the Son of God ; it was Christ's own voice , Christ's own power , by which they were to be raised ; else Christ declared neither any new thing , nor strange thing , to cause them to believe on him , because many others as instruments might utter such a voice. And the fol-

following verse clears it, that by the voice of the Son of God, the power of the Son of God is meant : *As the Father (saith Christ) hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.* The meaning is, that as the Father is the living God, and hath life in himself essentially, and is the root of life, to quicken the dead that are without life : so the Son hath life in himself essentially, and is the principle of life to others that are dead, and want it. And if this were not so, there could not be the strength of a Reason to confirm the foregoing verse. Christ had said, *They that hear the voice of the Son of God, shall live.* How doth he prove it ? Thus : *As the Father hath life in himself*; that is, As the Father is all life, essentially life, and the principle of life, to quicken whom he will by his mighty power : so the Son hath life in himself, (though it be communicated with his essence by eternal generation, which is suitable to a Son) and is essentially life, all life, and nothing else; and is the principle of life, quickning, by that life in himself, whom he will. I shall present one Scripture more, in *1 Joh.3.8.* *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.* This phrase, *the Son of God was manifested*, is a parallel-phrase with that in *1 Tim.3.16.* *God manifested in the flesh.* This God was God in the person of the Son, who was manifested in the flesh, that is, took the flesh of a Virgin upon him, and became man. For what end ? The Apostle shews, *that he might destroy* (that is, in

in man's nature might do it) *the works of the devil.* The Son of God destroyed ; but by whose power destroyed he the works of the devil ? By his own power : he is called one that is *stronger* than the devil, *Luke 11.12.* And if it had not been done by his own power , there was no necessity that the Son of God should have been manifested in the flesh for that purpose : for the Son of man might have done it as an Instrument, as the Disciples cast out devils ; (which was one of the works of Satan that was destroyed ; his work was to possess bodies , as well as souls ; and he was cast out ; which was the destruction of that work :) but the virtue by which they cast out , was none of theirs, but **Christ's** ; but Christ's virtue was his own : for, as one stronger, he spoiled Satan of all he had , and destroyed all his works ; wherein the Almightiness of Christ is manifest. And so it appears that Christ is such a Son of God that is Almighty, and so consequently no creature-son.

3. That Son of God that is omniscient , or all-knowing, cannot be a creature-son of God.

But Christ is such a Son of God that is omniscient and all knowing :

Therefore, he is not a creature-son of God.

The Major is clear , because Omnipotency is like Omnipotency ; it is incomunicable to the creature, being one of Gods attributes.

The Minor may be proved from *Revel.2.18, 23.* The words are : *Thus saith the Son of God, who hath*

bath his eyes like a flame of fire, that is, to give light to him in all the world, by which he may see all things. Therefore it is added. *And all the Churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the heart, and trieth the reins, and giveth to every one according to his works.* Christ speaketh of himself, as the Son of God, and shews what a Son he is; such a Son that is equal to his Father, who can search as deep, and inward, and hidden things as the Father can: he hath his Fathers eyes, his Fathers knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. It is the one onely God's privilege and prerogative, to search the heart, as I have proved from *Jer. 17.9, 10.* already; and yet Christ as the Son of God, doth it: Therefore he is no creature-son, but such a Son as is the one onely God also.

The fourth Argument, that carries on the same designe, *viz.* tends to prove this Doctrine of his against the Godhead of Christ to be destructive to the Gospel in some main point of it, is this:

Arg. 4. The Doctrine that subverts and destroys true Baptism, and brings in a false and unscriptural Baptism, that Doctrine destroys the true Gospel and Scripture, and brings in another Gospel and Scripture in a main point of it.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature, subverts and destroys true Baptism:

Therefore, this Doctrine of his destroys the true Gospel, &c.

The

The Major cannot be gainsaid, because Baptism is numbered among the highest Fundamentals of the Scripture, to be believed; the denying of which, will destroy, if any thing will destroy: *Eph.4.5.6. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism; one God and Father of all.* And it is called a principle, *Heb.6.1.2.* And because the fruit of Christ's death, which stands in remission of sins, is the mystical and spiritual part of Baptism, *Acts 22.16.1 Pet.3.21.*

The Minor Proposition may be thus corroborated and confirmed.

That Doctrine that brings in a Baptism which is into the Name of a meer creature, subverts and destroys true Scriptural Baptism; and brings in a false unscriptural Baptism.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature, doth bring in or set up a Baptism which is into the Name of a meer creature.

Therefore, this Doctrine of his subverts and destroys true Scriptural Baptism.

I shall strengthen both Propositions, because perhaps he will deny both; and will begin with the proof of the Major, viz. that to baptize into the Name of a meer creature, destroys true Baptism, and sets up a false.

1. Because the true Scriptural Baptism is the Seal of a Covenant, betwixt that one true God, and the believer that partakes of it; in which the believer consecrates and gives up himself to believe on, and be

be servant to the true God : God and the believer are the confederates. The believer is not confederate with any creature : As he gives not himself up to the creature , so neither can any creature accomplish for him those great blessings of the Covenant ; but he depends upon God alone for them. The Covenant which is sealed, is the Covenant of Grace, by which we are saved.

2. Because true Gospel-Baptism is the confirmation of Adoption, which respects the true God alone : for in Baptism, the Name of God is named upon the believer, and the believer carries God's Name upon him. And this the Apostle *Paul* doth point at, when he reproves the *Corinthians* for calling themselves by the name of *Paul*, saying, *I am of Paul*. The Argument that he makes use of against them, is this : *Were you baptized into the name of Paul* ? As if he should have said ; His Name ye bear , and his children ye are, into whose Name ye were baptized : but were ye baptized into the name of *Paul* , that you will carry his name ? No, ye were not ; but into the Name of God , to note out your adoption to God. To be adopted, and to be the sons and daughters of the Almighty, is all one , 2 Cor. 6.18. And we are not adopted into sonship to any creature : that is unscriptural doctrine, and not to be received.

3. Because true Gospel-Baptism is the acknowledgement of the believers subjection unto Divine Sovereignty, or the authority of the most high God : for by *Name* , Authority is frequently understood :

to

to do a thing in the Name of any Prince, or Monarch, or State, is to do in the Virtue, Power, and Authority of them ; and to baptize in the Name, is to baptize in the Authority of God, whose Ordinance it is, and from whom the blessing must come.

And for such-like reasons as these, it was, that the Apostle shunned and declined baptizing into his own name: he looked upon it as sacrilegious to God, and an usurping upon God, *I Cor. I. 14, 15. I thank God (saith he) I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I baptized into mine own name.* Thus jealous was Paul, lest he should assume and arrogate to himself that which is the prerogative of, and is proper to God.

The Minor Proposition, *viz.* That this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature, doth bring in, and set up, a Baptism which is into the name of a meer creature, carries evidence in it self, because Baptism is an Ordinance that (without contradiction) is into the Name of Christ, and consequently into the name of a meer creature, if whole Christ be a creature.

Object. All that (I can foresee) can be alleadged by him against this, is, That Baptism is principally into the Name of the Father; and that it is through Christ, as an instrument through whom the Father doth bestow the blessings of Baptism.

Sol. But, 1. How doth Scripture justify this? where doth it give witness to it? If not, it is not

derogatory to Christ to imagine it. 2. Why doth Christ joyn himself and the Spirit with the Father, as three associates, without any shadow of difference or disparity ; whose Persons are three, but whose Name is but one ? It is not said, Names, but Name : for as their Essence is one, so their Name is one ; as they are one Lord , so their Name is one. 3. Baptism hath been into the Name of the Lord Jesus alone , without the mention of the Father at all. *Acts 19.5. When they heard this, they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus.* Baptism did run in such a form , as that sometimes the Name of Christ was onely used, and the Father and the holy Ghost were wholly silenced , but never excluded. And can it be conceived, that if the Name of the Father be the Name of that person which is principal , and the Name of the Son be the Name of a person that is onely instrumental , that in the form of Baptism, or words of institution, the Name of the principal person should be pretermitted, and the name of the Name of the instrument mentioned ? There is neither Sence, nor Reason, nor Pattern, nor Example for it.

Object. But it may be objected, That *Moses* was but an instrument in that Baptism of the cloud and of the sea, that is spoken of in *1 Cor. 10.2.* and yet it is laid, that *they were all baptized into Moses, in the cloud, and in the sea.*

Sol. *Moses* is not to be considered as an Instrument, but as a Type of Christ , who was present with

with the children of *Israel* in the pillar of the cloud, — and in the pillar of fire : and they were baptized into *Moses* mystically, and figuratively, as into the Type ; but really and truely they were baptized into Christ, who was the Antitype, and in whom that which was in shadow in reference to *Moses*, was in substance, and was fulfilled in reference unto Christ, as hath been demonstrated before.

For further conviction because I discern that some are *slowe of heart to believe* the desperateness and damnablenes of this Doctrine, I shall propound another Argument to prove the destructiveness of this his Tenant to the Gospel, and Scriptures, in some main points of them.

Arg. 5. That Doctrine which denies and destroys the sufficiencie of Christ as a Saviour, denies and destroys the true Gospel and Scripture; and not onely in a main point, but in the main scope of them.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature, doth deny and destroy the sufficiencie of Christ as a Saviour :

Therefore, this Doctrine of his doth deny and destroy the Gospel, and whole Scripture, not onely in a main point, but in the main scope of them.

The Major Proposition will be readily confessed by him, and denied by none ; therefore needs no proof.

The Minor Proposition must be fortified, else it will be challenged as flanderous.

I therefore prove it by a double medium.

¶ That Doctrine that denies Christ to be the author of salvation, and makes him an instrument onely in the hand of him that is the author; that Doctrine denies Christ to be a sufficient Saviour.

But this Doctrine of his, which makes whole Christ a creature, doth deny Christ to be the author of salvation, and makes him onely an instrument in the hand of the Father, who is the author:

Therefore, this Doctrine of his denies Christ to be a sufficient Saviour.

He may perhaps deny the Major, and distinguish of sufficiencie, and say there is an absolute and independent sufficiencie, which is proper to that which is the author of a thing; and there is a limited and restrained sufficiencie, depending upon that absolute sufficiencie of the author, which is suitable and proper to an instrument; and this latter Christ hath, and so is sufficient through God, through the Father, for the work of salvation, though he be but a creature.

But such an Answer must be judged weak, for two Reasons. 1. The sufficiencie of Christ to save, is an absolute sufficiencie; and such as is proper to the author of salvation, according to the testimony of the Scripture, *Heb. 5.9.* *And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to them that obey him.* Now I hope he will not

con-

confound the Author and the Instrument, and make them one person. An instrumental sufficiencie the Scripture knows nothing of, in reference to Christ, nor doth attribute any such to him. 2. An instrumental sufficiencie is no other then insufficiencie: for an instrument is not able to save to the utmost, and so is of himself insufficient to save; but Christ is able of himself to save to the utmost, Heb. 7. 25.

But he perhaps will endeavour to evade the strength of this Assertion, by laying, that if Christ be able, through God the Father, to save to the utmost, it is sufficient for the verifying of Scripture.

But neither hath this Answer strength in it, nor is Scripture verified by it: for Scripture speaks of Christs ability, as ability in himself; Heb. 1. 3, Christ is described to be one that *upholds all things by the word of his own power*, and to purge sin away by himself: and Christ never needed to say of the Father, as Paul said of Christ, *I am able to do all things through Christ that strengthens me*; so Christ, I am able to do all things through the Father that strengthens me: and though he might be strengthened, as the Son of man, yet not as the Son of God; but drew on the people to believe a Divine power in himself: for his words are without any limitation. *Dost thou believe that I am able to do this for thee?* saith he to one that came to be cured of him, without interposing any words which should shew his dependence on another. And this ability was Divine ability, because it lay in this, viz. to

hal without the efficacie of means which might conduce to such a purpose. And Christ is called *the power of the Father*, because the Father's power is in him. And it is said that *God laid help upon one that is mighty*; which, though spoken of *David*, yet of him but as the Type; and is meant of Christ, who is the Antitype, and who is truely mighty. This ability of Christ within himself to save to the utmost, is that which the Apostle disputed for, in many places of that Epistle, and especially in the Context of that Scripture, *Heb. 7. 25.*
He is able to save to the utmost: for he doth detect the insufficiencie of the High-priest to save, by shewing their mortality, and other infirmities; and then presents Christ's sufficiencie. And if it were so that God could have saved by an instrument which derives his vertue from him, and is dependent upon him, a Saviour needed not to have come from heaven; for God might have done it by any earthly creature, or by any creature-instrument, without any respect had to power or ability as inherent in it at all, but by his own power manifested by it; and so might have saved by an Apostle, equally as by a Christ.

But I shall prove what I designe, by another medium.

2. That Doctrine which renders Christ insufficient to the work of saving, renders him an insufficient Saviour, or destroys his sufficiencie as a Saviour.

But

But this Doctrine of his renders Christ insufficient
to perform the work of saving, &c.

Which I prove thus :

If Christ be a meer creature, he is insufficient to execute those three Offices of King, Priest, and Prophet, to perform the work which those Offices do call for, for the saving of men.

I shall begin with his Prophetical Office, unto the execution of which it is necessary, not onely to open the Scriptures to men, that they may conceive of them, but to open the understandings of men to understand them ; and to give them eye-salve, that they may see : which, because it belongs to his Office as a Prophet, he must be able to do from vertue and ability within himself. But no creature can effect this by any power of its own, nor is capable to receive such power from another, because it is not competent to the creature ; and consequently Christ being onely a creature (as he holds him) is disabled in the principal work of that Office.

And, as a Priest, he was to offer up himself to God through the eternal Spirit, that he might purge away sin, and that his Blood might be of greater efficacie then the blood of bulls and goats ; and that he might purchase eternal redemption for believers : which as a creature he could not do, *Heb. 9.12.* So that he disables him in the works of his Priestly Office, in holding him onely to be a creature.

And, as a King, he must conquer Death, by raising

himself up from the dead , which he was to suffer as a Priest, to take away sin. And he must also destroy sin in its regnancie by Kingly power , in his members, as he was to condemn it in its guilt by his death : which work is above the power of any meer creature. So that by this opinion of his , he is made weak to perform all his Offices , which yet he came into the world to accomplish ; and that he is made an insufficient Saviour ; which overturns the Gospel, in the principal scope of it. But of this more hereafter.

The last Argument which I shall now produce to prove another Gospel and Scripture to be brought in, and the true Gospel and Scripture to be destroyed, is this :

Arg. 6. That Doctrine which tends to overturn and destroy the mystery of godlines, tends also to overturn and destroy the Gospel and Scripture.

But this Doctrine of his serves to overturn and destroy the mystery of godlines :

Therefore, it destroys the Gospel and Scripture.

The Major Proposition he will not have the boldness to make question of.

The Minor Proposition I prove from *1 Tim. 3. 16.* *Great is the mystery of godliness , God manifest in the flesh , justified in the spirit , seen of Angels , preached to the Gentiles , believed on in the world , received up into glory.*

Thus the words run in all the Original Copies,
unclesis

unless one, in which the word *God* is left out (as is conceived) expunged by the *Arrians*; but the sense of all comes to be subverted by it.

I shall give the sense of the words, and then deduct the consequence from it: and shall begin with the subject that is spoken of, and then speak of the predicate of that which is asserted.

God manifest in the flesh] The Son of God, or God in the person of the Son appearing in flesh, by assuming flesh, and uniting it to his own person.

Justified in the Spirit] Justified by the Godhead to be God; that is, by the rays and beams that sparkled out, and shined forth in the flesh, suitable to the expressions of the Apostle, *Joh. 1. 14. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of God.* &c.

Seen of angels] Attended by Angels in his incarnation, ministry, sufferings, rising, ascending, as the story of the Gospel shews, which gave witness to this mystery of God in flesh.

Preached to the Gentiles] Preached in this mystery of the incarnation to be *God over all, blessed for ever.*

Believed on in the world] Received as God in our nature, as the *Immanuel*, as very God, as the most high God, by faith; as *Thomas* did receive him, so all Saints ought: *My Lord (faith he) and my God.*

Received up into glory] Taken up to heaven to receive the glory; not that which was of new given to

to him as a reward of his sufferings, but the glory which he had before the world was; which Divine glory was made more apparent in flesh, which was obscured before very much, and veiled in it.

That which is predicated or declared of this subject, is, that it is a *mystery of godliness*.

Great is the mystery] It is one of the great depths of God; it is the depth of depths, the head and height of all mysteries; which *eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and which hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive*; which flesh and blood hath not revealed, but the Father that is in heaven by the Spirit; *viz.* that God in the person of the Son, was sent by the Father, and by consent with the Father, gave himself to a state of debasement, humbled himself, and appeared in the fashion of a man, by taking flesh of the Virgin, and becoming together with it one person, *viz.* *Oscarposus*, God-man; God in the person of the Son, and the Son of man, making one Christ.

This truth was witnessed by the Spirit, *viz.* by the Divinity of the second person made flesh, by some glory of the Godhead of the Son, which in flesh appeared, and declared him to be what he was; and testified by the attendance of Angels, and preached, and believed by all sorts of men whom God hath ordained to life, and sealed to the satisfaction of all that might doubt, by his assumption into glory; Jehovah the Father therein speaking to Jehovah the Son, *Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine*

ene-

enemies thy footstool. Some such enemies were those which contradicted him , and called it blasphemy, when he said that he was the Son of God, or God in the person of the Son ; which is all one. *This* (faith the Apostle) *is the great mystery* which is transcendent above all reason in the sons of men.

Of godliness] This is that truth, in the acknowledgement of which, and in the assent to which, all godliness is founded and bottomed : For it is the Gospel in the grand mystery of it , *the Son in flesh*, that being preached to the world , and received by faith , becomes the seed of all piety and godliness, by which we are begotten to God , and are made partakers of the Divine nature. This mystery of Christ revealed , forms Christ in the hearts of those to whom it is revealed. This Doctrine known and believed , changeth men into the same image ; that as the eternal Son of God in flesh is become man-like, so they (after they have acknowledged it by faith) are made God-like : for therein is the rich grace and glorious mercy of the Lord revealed. The love of the Father is transcendent in glory,in giving such a Son,who is the express image of himself. and the same God essentially with himself: And the love of the Son is superlative, and above all the conceptions of the sons of men,in giving himself, when it is rightly understood that this *Self* whom he gives is God blessed for ever.

This truth believed, works astonishment, and the soul is ravished with the thoughts of it. But the other,

other, *viz.* God's giving a Creature for us , and a Creature's giving it self for us , is a lowe busyness, in comparison of this : nor can the heart be so confirmed, in apprehension of the love of God, nor can it be so inflamed with love to God ; but this mystery (as the Apostle lays it down) quickens faith & love, and heightens them ; which graces are the chariots to carry the soul out to all godliness and honesty.

The consequence of which is , Whoever denies this mystery, denies and destroys godliness , and, in so doing, denies and destroys the Gospel , which is called by the Apostle, *doctrine which is after godliness*, I Tim.6.3. Tit.1.1.

And this is of weighty consideration to all those that acknowledge Christ to be God, and yet hold it not very dreadful in those that do gainsay it , but account them Saints and godly perlons : which they cannot groundedly do , while the evidence of this text is against them, which faith. *Great is the mystery of godliness. God manifest in the flesh.* And if they acknowledge the truth of this text, then this text will stare them in the face, while they cry up the godliness of such who do oppose it. Where is their godlinelis, if this mysterie (which they acknowledge not) be the mysterie of godliness ? If godliness be the fruit of this doctrine, rightly understood, & received; if it grow upon the tree of this truth, and they hew down this tree, destroy this truth in the opinion which they hold ; doth not the fruit fall with it ? Godlinelis is cut down with the tree out of which it grows ; it is plucked

plucked up with the root that bears it. What can be said against this? Me thinks every tongue should be silent hence-forward, that subscribes to this text, *Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, &c.*

But enough hath been spoken of this, to convince any one that loves the Truth, and will open his eyes to receive it.

I shall now undertake the maintaining of such Arguments or Instances (as he calls them) which I produced to shew the repugnancie of his Doctrine to the Gospel, and to the Scripture, and discover the weakness and unsoundness of the Answers that he gives.

The first Argument or Instance, was :

Instance 1. If Christ be but a meer creature, and not God , then the giving of Divine worship, and honour, and service to a meer creature , is lawful, and warrantable ; which yet is everywhere forbidden, in reference to any creature , but is practised unto Christ, *Rev. 5.1 2.1 3,1 4.* and would be idolatry, if Christ were not God.

He puts this Instance into form:

To give Divine worship, honour , and service to a meer creature, is contrary to the Scripture.

To give Divine worship, honour , and service to Christ, is not contrary to , but by the warrant of Scripture :

Therefore, Christ is not a meer creature.

He answers to the Major Proposition , and distinguisheth of Divine worship, honour, and service.

First,

First, (he saith) *All worship and honour which of right belongs to any creature, is in some sense divine, God being the principal author, and ultimate centre thereof*, Rom.13. & Eph.6.7.

Rep. But he might as truly say, Every warrantable action that a man performs, is divine, because it hath God for the principal Author, and ultimate Centre ; that is, it hath God's command for the beginning of it, and God's glory for the end of it. But by such distinguishing, he confounds what ought to be distinguished ; he makes Divine worship and Civil worship to be the same thing, because God is the principal Author and ultimate Centre of them both : but these two have ever been distinguished by our Writers, and made opposite species of Worship. Therefore it was very frivolous for him to look upon Divine Worship in that sense.

2. He saith, *But if you mean, in the strictest sense, that worship, honour and service which is peculiar to the most high God ; then I shall say with you that it is Idolatry, and contrary to the Scriptures, to give it to any creature whatsoever.*

Rep. The controversie betwixt us and the Papists, is, what Worship is peculiar to God, and what is not peculiar, but may be given to a creature. And we assert against them, that all Divine worship and honor is peculiar to God, and none of it communicable to any meer creature. But he tells us of some Divine worship which is peculiar, and of some that is not pecu-

peculiar. For the better understanding of this Truth, let it be looked into what Divine Worship is, and what the grounds thereof are.

Divine Worship is that Observance in which we are carried directly and immediately to God, in doing those things that directly bring honour to him, and glorifie him, in Rom. 1. 21. *When they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, &c. 2 Cor. 8.5. They first gave themselves up unto the Lord, and then to us, according to the will of God.*

The ground of this Worship or Observance, is, that excellencie of God, which in his sufficiencie and efficiencie shines forth. It is not one attribute or perfection in God, that is the formal and adequate cause and reason of Divine Worship ; but it is the concurrence of all infinite perfections and excellencies, Exod. 34.6,7. *The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and full of truth &c.* Therefore it is that sometimes one attribute in God is said to ingender homage and worship, Psal. 130.4. *But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayst be feared.* And sometimes another, Heb. 12. 28, 29. *Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire.* And Divine worship is the acknowledgement of the infinite Majestie, Truth, Wisdom, Goodness, Glory of the blessed God.

Divine Worship hath been wont to be divided
into

into Natural worship, and Instituted worship.

Natural worship flows from the very knowledge of God, if it be right and true, though there were no Law to impose any such thing upon men; and it consists in faith, and love, and fear, and hope, and thankfulness, and in praying unto God, and hearing what God the Lord will say to them: for of these, such who have a right knowledge of God, will soon be convinced: *Psal. 9. 10. They that know thy Name, will trust in thee.* And hereto also doth belong some natural external acts and postures of the body, which do hold forth the reverence and homage of the minde; as the bowing of the knees, and prostrating of the bxdy before God.

Instituted worship is certain *mediums* or means, ordained by the will of God, for the putting forth and exercising of natural worship, viz. faith, love, hope, fear, &c. which are inward acts of the minde, and graces whereby we gratifie God, and honour him; and belong to Natural worship.

This Instituted worship consists in Ordinances and Services of God's own appointment, in which the Natural worship of faith, hope, fear, &c. are acted, and by which they are promoted.

Having shewed what Divine Worship is, and the grounds and kindes of it, it remains that I declare that all Divine Worship, (and not some alone, as he asserts) is peculiar to God, and not to be given to any creature, that is no more then a creature.

1. That which is limited and restrained by God to God alone, in the first and second Commandment, and inhibited and forbidden to be given to any other, that must needs be peculiar to God alone. But all divine worship, both natural and instituted, together with the postures that do attend them, as applied to divine worship, are limited and restrained by God to God only, and prohibited to be given to any other: Therefore it must needs be proper and peculiar to God.

For what else is the sense of those two Commandments; *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me: Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, &c.* but an injunction of the having and exercising such divine Graces and Affections upon and towards God above, and a submitting to divine directions and instructions from God, in reference to the means of worship, and to him alone? All that hath been written and preached by the most approved, looks this way. They say naturall worship is forbidden in the one, and ordained worship in the other; and he that gives the natural to any but the true God, sets up and makes to himself another God beside him; and he that sets up, or submits to any formes of worship, without the dictate or warrant of the true God, commits Idolatry against the true God.

2. That which Christ doth appropriate to God, that must needs be peculiar to him.

But Christ doth appropriate divine worship to

M

God

God alone, Mat. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve.

Therefore divine worship is peculiar to God, and may not be given to any other.

That which the Devil required of Christ, was prostration, or bowing his body to the ground before him, in a Religious way ; as for his heart, and the faith of it, and love of it, and fear of it, and affections of it, in any kind, or the intention of those affections, he mentions them not, requires them not, nor could he know whether they were given to him, or no, nor in what degree and measure ; but the outward homage onely, in the inclination of the body to the earth, in a religious way ; and Christ yeelds not to it, but repels him with the Scripture, which he fetcheth from *Deut. 6. 13.* or from Chap. 10. 20. or from Chap. 26. 10. for I find no other that Christ can allude to, and Expositors do direct to the two former ; but in none of them is it said. *Him onely shalt thou serve* ; nor is it applyed to external adoration : but our Saviour, an infallible expositor, doth extend it to religious postures, and outward homage in a spiritual way, and doth restrain it to God alone.

3. That which the Apostle condemned in the *Galatians*, while they were heathen, that cannot be allowable in Christians.

But the doing of Religious service, or giving religious or divine worship to them, which by nature

ture are not Gods, is the thing that the Apostle condemns in the *Galatians*, while they were Heathens, *Gal. 4.8.*

Therefore it is not allowable in Christians.

The Heathens when they worshipped stocks and stones, and works of the hands of the Workman, they did it *relative*, not *terminative*; that is, they worshipped the highest being in these, and did not terminate and end their worship in these, but used these as helps in that worship which they directed to the most High God, whom they knew not, and carried their worship through these to him; as from *Acts 17. 23.* compared with *25. 29.* will appear. They worshipped Idols of silver and gold, and graven stone, yet they knew that those Idols made by mens hands were not God, but there was an unknown God, whom they worshipped in such Images: Yet this worship was accounted by the Apostle a doing service to them which by nature are not Gods, and was condemned: And this intermediate service which was not terminated in the thing served, will not be allowed, as belonging to any other but to him, who is essentially God, and by nature God.

4. That which neither the Angels, nor the most eminent Saints on earth, durst accept, though tended to them, because they were but creatures, but directed it to God as proper onely to him, that ought not to be given to any creature, but is peculiar to God. But divine Religious worship manifested in the outward prostration of the body, was a thing that the

Angels, and the most eminent Saints, durst not accept of, because they were but creatures ; but directed it to God, as proper to him alone : Therefore divine Religious Worship ought not to be given to any meer creature, but is peculiar to God.

There are many Scriptures which serve to confirm that which can in reason onely be questioned in this Argument, *viz.* Whether all divine Religious worship, though intermediate, and in the lowest degree, was rejected by Angels and Saints, as undue to them, and as proper to God : for this purpose, see *Act.10.26.* where may be found, that Adoration with the body, which did proceed from the estimation of the mind, though *Cornelius* that tended it, knew *Peter*, to whom he tended it, neither to be God nor Christ ; nor had he that esteem of him, nor did he terminante that worship which he gave him, upon him ; for he was better instructed ; but through him looked at God : yet the thing was evil that he did, and undue to *Peter*, or to any meer man whatever, and was therefore rejected by *Peter* upon that ground and account ; *Stand up* (said he) *for I my self am also a man* : as if he should have said, I am not God, but a man, a meer man, and nothing more ; therefore it is not proper to adore me thus.

So also in *Rev.19.10.* and chap. *22.9.* *John* fell at the Angel to worship him, knowing him to be but an Angel, and looking upon him only as one through whom he had found favor to have such things shewed him, and as one superiour to him, because an Angel,

as Rev. 3 2.8. shews, *I fell down at the feet of the Angel that had shewed me these things*; it was upon this account that he fell down, He was an Angel, and had shewed such things to him; he was not God, nor Christ, nor did John look upon him so: and it was but an outward prostrating of his body before him, arising from that reverent esteem that he had of him; yet it was not accepted by the Angel, but repelled and with this Argument repelled, *I am thy fellow-servant, (as indeed the highest creatures are) and of thy Brethren, that have the testimony of Jesus; see therefore thou do it not; worship God.* Whence it is apparent, that the lowest degree of Religious divine Worship, is too high for any creature.

5. That wherein Gods glory lies, and which he is so dear of, that he will not give it to any other, and which when it hath been given to another, by his people, hath stirred up his jealousie, that must needs be proper and peculiar to God, and is not to be given to any other below God. But all divine religious worship is such a thing wherein Gods glory lies, and of which God is so dear, that he will not give it to any other, but proves jealous presently if it be given: Therefore all divine Religious worship is so proper and peculiar to God, that it is not to be given to another.

The Scriptures that prove the Minor proposition, which alone may be questioned, are Isa. 42.8. *I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my glory will I*

not give to another, nor my praise to a graven Image. This Glory which God will not give to any other, is such worship which was wont to be given to a graven Image, and which the children of *Israel* gave to the Calf in *Horeb*, which was intermediate worship, and was not terminated in the Calf, but in God; and yet God would not give that from him. And when God gives the second Commandment, in which he forbids to be worshipped through an Image, (and by Image, any thing that may be thought of to represent him, is meant, as all confess that have been accounted Orthodox) he mentions his jealousy which will arise in his breast, if such worship be tendered him; he will count it as if the Image, the creature, the representative, whatever it be, were worshipped, and not he; and he will visit that sin upon the Fathers unto their children to many Generations.

By this time I hope it will be evident unto the Reader, That all divine Religious worship is peculiar to God alone. I shall now proceed to consider of the residue of his Answer.

He undertakes to shew difference betwixt the worship that is peculiar to God, and all other worship. His words are these:

That worship, honour, service, which is peculiar to God, differs from that which may be yielded to a creature, partly in the matter, but wholly in the manner of it. We must pray to God for all things we want, and may pray to men for what they

they can give ; we must obey God , and we must . . .
 obey men who are set over us by God : but we
 may not worship, honour, and serve men in the
 like manner as we do the most high God , who is
 the principal and ultimate object of all worship,
 honour and service ; his right thereto being onely
 of himself , and he himself being the sole end
 thereof. According to this sense, is that com-
 mand which our Saviour mentions. Mat. 4.10.
*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God , and him
 onely shalt thou serve.*

Rep. In these Lines, he hath multiplyed words,
 but hath not increased knowledge ; he hath told us
 of a difference, but hath not shewed us what it is ;
 he hath instanced in matter and manner, but not de-
 clared wherein , in what particulars, in either ; he
 shewed reasons of a difference , why it must be so ;
 God is first and last , therefore none must be wor-
 shipped as he : but the difference is yet in the dark ;
 I would intreat any one to fetch it out of his words,
 if he can. And if there be any light in his expressi-
 ons , that light is darkness, yea blackness of dark-
 ness : he hath said that God is the principal and ult-
 imate object of all worship, and so he leaves it, and
 therein he opens a dore to all Popish Idolatry ; a
 man may worship a stock, or a stone, or any thing,
 provided that God be the first and the last , the
 principal and ultimate object in that worship that
 he gives thereto. What would any Papist desire
 more at his hands ? A graven Image may be an ob-

ject of his worship, if it be not the principal object, nor the ultimate, but that he pass through it to God.

As for the difference in matter, he mentioned it, and then deserted it, without giving the least hint what it is. It had been needful that he should have pitched upon some act or acts of worship of which it might have been said. This act is so proper and peculiar to God (materially considered) as that the like material act may not be performed to any that is not God : But he foresaw that the giving of an instance herein, would have lost the cause he pleads for : for though he might have given instances many, which might have held in reference to all other creatures, yet not any that would hold in reference to Christ, whom he makes but a creature; therefore he is silent. And though he gives instances of acts materially the same, which are performed to God and men ; as praying, obeying ; and saith the difference is in the manner of performing these acts, yet he gives no satisfaction in reference to this diversity of manner. And he mentions not the grounds of worship, and honour, and service, wherein the root of the difference lies ; for, the grounds are such upon which we worship God, that because we meet not with them in any creature we have to do with, therefore we neither dare give the same worship for matter, or manner, that we give to God, to any creature.

But as if he had given light enough, he concludes,

that

that *Mat. 4.10.* must be understood according to that sense. What sense means he? He would have God to be the principal and ultimate object in all worship; and that is enough, according to him; and being observed, Christ might have worshipped the devil, for any other caveat that he enters against it.

I do not wrong him one whit; for his words are, That the command which Christ mentions in repelling Satan that tempted him to worship him, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,* must be restrained to God, as he is the principal and ultimate object only: and then if Christ had so understood it, as he doth, and reserved to God his own place of worship, had made him his principal and ultimate object in worship, he might as the less principal and intermediate object, have worshipped the devil, if he had plea'd. And this Text which he alledgedeth, of *Mat. 4.* (if there had been none other) would not have been of any force in this fence against it. So that either Christ mistook the Scripture, and alledged a Text that had not strength against worshipping of Satan, or else he hath grossly mistaken the sense of the Scripture which Christ hath alleadged, in giving liberty for intermediate worship to be given to him that is not God, notwithstanding any thing contained in this Text.

But because he keeps to generals, and by that means resolves no scruple that may lie in the breasts
of

of men about worship. I shall descend to some particulars.

And first, I shall speak of worship proper to God in the matter of it, wherein he is wholly silent; and then of worship proper in the manner of the performance.

1. To believe or receive any report of spiritual things and matters of Faith which respect the soul, propoled and presented as a truth to be rested in upon the meer credit and fidelity of the Testator, or him that witnesseth it, is a worship and an honour proper to God alone, because God is he alone that cannot lye, *Tit. 1. 2.* and it was the honour that *Sarah* by this Faith gave to God, she judged him faithful that had promised, *Heb. 11. 11.*

2. A Religious resting and depending for spiritual supply and help in spiritual works and streights, is a worship and honour peculiar to God alone: the reason is, because there is no sufficiency of this kind in any creature, but it is onely and wholly in God, *2 Cor. 3. 5.* Therfore the Prophet directs him that is in darkness, and hath no light, (it is spoken of the souls darknes and distreis) to trust in the Name of the Lord, and stay upon his God. *11a. 5. 10.*

3. An acquiescence in the will of another, whether it appear to be with us, or whether it appear to be against us, is an homage and an honour which is proper and peculiar to God alone, *1 Sam. 3. 18* *It is the Lord* (said Eli) *let him do what seemeth good in his eyes:* he submits quickly, to that which

which was terrible to be thought of, upon this account or ground, *It is the Lord*, to whom such subjection is due. And Jesus Christ himself as man doth acquiesce, and rest satisfied with the will of God, which was bitter as death : *Not my will, but thine be done.*

And the obeying of the will of another, for this sole reason, because it is the will of that other, when there is no other impulsive cause but that, is honour peculiar and proper to God alone, because his will, and his alone, is Essentially holy and just, and good. *I consulted not with flesh and blood* (saith Paul) when the will of God was revealed that he should teach him, *Gal. 1. 15, 16.* and *Rom. 1. 2. 2.*

4. Praying, as it is an act of Religion, and then especially, when it is for spiritual blessings, is a worship which is proper to God alone; because such a service simply considered in its nature, doth imply a sufficiency of wisdom, power and goodness, in the person to whom we direct it : in reference to which, praying to any creature is accounted as praying to a god that cannot save; and it is Idolatry in Scripture-reckoning, *Isa. 45. 20. Jer. 1. 27.*

5. Giving of praise, and glory, and thanks (as it is an act of Religion) is worship and honour due to God alone, and not to be communicated to any creature; because he is the root and fountain of all good to the creature, the God of all Grace and mercy, the God of blessing. Therefore in *Rev. 4. 9, 10. 11,* *The four beasts, and the four and twenty*

twenty Elders, they worship him that sate upon the Throne by giving praise to him, and cast down their Crowns at his feet, and say he is worthy to receive honour and glory, because he had created all things. And as in the time of the old Testament, to offer Sacrifices of Thanksgiving to any but to the true God, had been Idolatry (which caused *Paul & Barnabas* to run in with haste to stop them in the attempt of Sacrificing to them, by telling them that they were but men like themselves) so to offer the Calves of the Lips, to offer praise, to give Thanks, in a Religious way, is worship peculiar to God.

6. To Swear, or to appeal Solemnly in a religious way for Testimony, in reference to any thing asserted, for the truth of it, is worship or honour that is proper to God, and not to be given to any creature, *Deut. 6. 13. Thou shalt fear the Lord, and serve him, and swear by his Name.* And it is reproved that some did *swear by the Lord and by Malchom*, that is, for joyning God and Idols together, in the worship of an Oath; and under that, all other worship is comprehended.

7. The use of a Lot, in which persons that are at some controversie, or are doubtful what to determine of a thing, do give up themselves to receive the determination of it, as the Lot being cast shall decide it, it is a worship and an honour proper to God. *Prov. 16. 33. The Lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposition thereto is from the Lord.*

Lord. Therefore it was used with invocation, or prayer to God, wherein men do profess to receive the doome, or sentence, or judgement, or decision from the Lord, *Act. 1.24.*

8. A receiving of, and submitting unto, prescribed forms and rules, as *mediums*, in and by which that natural worship of the heart, which consists in faith, and hope, and love, is exercised and declared, is worship and honour proper and peculiar to God alone, and forbidden in reference to any creature, in the second Commandment : for under the names of *graven image*, invented forms and *mediums* of worship, excogitated and minted in mens own brain, or of any others prescribing, that is not God, are meant : and indeed, who knows what is pleasing to God, and delightsome to him, but himself? therefore the prerogative is his to prescribe ; and it is peculiar honour for men, to submit to what he doth prescribe. The subjecting of the Conscience to Laws, and Ordinances, and Institutions, and Directions, is an honor not communicable to any creature, but wherein God is alone, not having any to share with him ; for the Conscience is over-awed by none but God, gives account to none but God : *Rom. 2.15*, the Apostle proves the love of God to be written in the excusing and accusing, which work manifestly declares a Law of God within, because the Conscience is accountable to nothing but such a Law : for there lies the strength of his Argument, that there is such a Law within them,

10. In external postures, in Religious duties, the prostration of the body towards the earth, and kneeling upon the knees towards the ground, is homage, and honour, and worship peculiar to God : *O come let us fall down and kneel before the Lord our Maker*, saith the Prophet, in *Psal. 95.6.* And its that which neither Angel nor men durst assume, no nor admit of, but repelled it, and rejected it as undue, and directed it to God.

Many more particulars there are, respecting the matter of worship, where God hath a peculiarity in point of right to worship and honour, above the creature : but some light is let in to such (which might be groping in the dark) by these.

I shall take in that light which Christ affords, (while I speak of the manner of worship) and satisfie my self with that. He sums up all the Commandments that respect God, in these words; *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and serve him with all thy soul, with all thy mind, with all thy strength and might.* So that that which is peculiar in the manner of worship, is the measure of performance. Such a measure ought not to be given to any creature, as to God: a person may be easily peccant in the excess, in reference to the creature : if he give all to the creature, he gives too much; but less than all, is too little for God ; the utmost created height is due to God , and peculiarly due to him , and to none other.

1. An absolute Faith, and affiance, and trust, is due

due to God alone, whatever the Subject-matter of it be, because there is an absolute and an independent sufficiency in God alone to effect every thing; therefore it is that which the Lord pronounceth a blessed thing, *Jer. 17. 7. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is:* And the contrary the Lord pronounceth a cursed thing, ver. 5. *Cursed be he that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm.* A like place we have in *Psal. 146. 3, 5.*

2. An absolute and unbounded love is due to God alone, because he is infinite in goodness; and not to be given to any creature, *I Joh. 2. 15. Love not the world, nor the things of the world, &c.* Not the simple love, but the inordinate of the love of the world, is forbidden; but God himself is to be loved with all the strength of the heart, *Mat. 22. 37.*

3. An absolute and unlimited fear is proper to God alone because he is the Sovereign Lord, and to him it belongs to kill, or to keep alive; yea, he can kill and cast into hell, *Luk. 12. 51.* They are first taken off from fearing the creature, and are afterwards put on to fear God.

Much more might be added, if need did require: At present, let it satisfie the Reader, that I have thus far opened the difference in the matter and in the manner, betwixt the worship due to God, and that which may be given to the creature, which he left olded up in his Discourse about it. I must now pro-

proceed to follow him in his Answer.

He concludes his Answer to the Maior, with admiration : his words are ;

I wonder at the adjection (Meer) which you add to creature, as if a creature in essence could be more then a meer creature ; or, as if some creature might have, as its right and due, that honour, worship, and service which the Scripture doth appropriate to the most High God. And then he determines, Sure I am (faith he) creatures, as creatures, are excluded from sharing with God.

Rep. I wonder that he should make a wonder of that which himself is able to resolve, according to the common Tenent which himself so lately held ; and if he cannot, a child well bred, of 8 or 10 years old, can render a reason for it. Christ is a creature, and yet not a meer creature : according to the flesh, or as he is the son of *Abraham*, he is a creature ; but according to the Spirit of Holiness, or as he is the Son of God, he is not a creature : Christ is *Θεα?Sponos*, God-man, or God manifested in the flesh ; a creature, and yet created according to the divers natures that are in him. Consider him in one of his natures, as born of the Virgin, as the son of *Mary*, so he is a creature in essence, and in that respect he is no more then a creature, and is excluded from sharing with God in divine honour, worship, and service ; but consider him in both his natures, consider the whole of him, and then he is not a meer creature, but he is more then a creature ; he is such

a crea*

a creature, as that he is ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, the great Creator of all things, and so he shares with the Father in divine honour, but not as a creature, though he be a creature; for this person Christ, is both God and a Creature.

After he had spoken to the Major, he comes to consider of the Minor proposition, *viz.* That divine worship, and honour, and service, is by Scripture-warrant given to Christ Jesus.

His Answer is, *Sir, it is granted that Jesus Christ is the intermediate object of divine worship, honour, and service, being Gods Vice-Roy, and acting among them in his Fathers Name, which the Scripture you bring confirms; But where the Scripture allows worship, honour, and service to be given to him, as the principal and ultimate object thereof, is not yet made to appear.*

Rep. i. This distinction of intermediate object in reference to any meer creature, and principal and ultimate Object, is unscriptural, he cannot bottom it upon any Text in reference to divine and Religious prescribed worship.

2. It is repugnant to Scripture-Testimony in reference to the whole of Christ whom the Father will have to be honoured, as himself is honoured, *Joh. 5.*

23. That all may honour the Son as they honour the Father: The Father will have no honour which the Son hath not; will have nothing in honour that is peculiar, that may be accounted proper to him:

N

the

the Father will have no preeminence in worship above the Son ; but look in what manner he requires men to honour him. He requires them to honour his Son ; and unless they do it, he accounts not himself honoured. If then the Father be worshipped as the principal & ultimate object, the Son must be worshipped as the principal and ultimate object, else he is not honored as the Father is honored : The honouring of the Father is made the pattern and the example of honouring the Son. And if Christ should be but a creature, if this be not Gods giving his glory to another, when the like glory is given to him that is not God, as to him that is God ; the like to the Son as, to the Father, and that according to the Fathers own designe and counseil ; Let him that hath understanding judge : however, it overthrows his distinction.

The place also that I alledged in *Rev. 5. 12, 13, 14.* which he faith confirms his distinction, is fully against it ; for all creatures in heaven, earth, under the earth, are represented by *John* in the service of blessing, praising, honouring, glorifying the Father and the Son, in like manner, without any distinction : they are not heard worshipping the Father through the Son, but worshipping and honouring both Father and Son, in like manner as two equals, or as two coessential persons in the Godhead. Yea, lest it should be imagined, that he that sitteth upon the Throne, is the principal object of the worship, and that the Lamb is the less principal, subordinate, and in-

intermediate object of it, because he is mentioned first, and the Lamb is mentioned after him ; therefore *vers. 14.* the four and twenty Elders are brought in, in this vision, worshipping him alone *who liveth for ever and ever*, without the mention of any other, though other persons are not excluded. And who is this person that liveth for ever and ever ? It is Christ, who gives himself this Title, though it be his Fathers Title also, *Rev. 1.18.* *I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I live for ever and ever :* So it is in the Greek, and it concurs in words with this Text of *Rev. 5.14.*

3. This distinction, as he brings it and means it, opens a door to the worshipping of men or Angels, any that may be called God's representatives, and which act among men in Gods Name : for if that be the formal reason of worship given to Christ, *He is Gods Vice-Roy or Representative* (which are not Scriptural Titles, but names of his own or others devising) *and he is one that acts in Gods Name*, then worship may be given to *Moses, Joshua, the Prophets* ; for *Moses* was in Gods stead to *Aaron* and to the people : *I have made thee a God to Aaron*, saith the Lord to him, *Exod. 4.16.* And the Prophets came in Gods Name ; may they therefore be worshipped ? According to his Argument they may ; yea, any person or thing that is a means by whom or by which God dispenseth himself to men, in a Religious or spiritual way, or by whom or

which we come to God in worship, may be an intermediate object of Religious worship, and so we may worship our Ministers which go to God for us, and from God come to us ; and we may worship the Scriptures and the Ordinances, by which we have communion with God ; for these are intermediate things betwixt God and us in worship, may they therefore be intermediate objects of worship? Seeing he makes Christ such a god as other creatures are, (but more eminent then they) such a god as *Moses* was, as Magistrates and Judges were, which carried Gods authority in the Offices upon them, a god of the same kinde with them ; What reason can be rendered, if Christ be worshipped upon that account, why they also (being such-like gods as he, and coming with God's authority betwixt God and us) should not be worshipped as intermediate objects, upon the same account ? But this is very gross, and makes his assertion concerning worshipping Christ as an intermediate object betwixt God and us, very gross also.

4. It is apparent that Christ both assumed, and Saints and Angels have given to him, that very worship, and honour, and service which is peculiar to the high God alone, both for matter, and for manner.

1. Doctrines, Institutions, and Ordinances, have been received, submitted to, upon the testimony and authority of Christ alone, *Mat. 5.21, 22. 1 Cor. 11.23, 24.*

2. The

2. The Ordinances, Institutions, Laws, and Rites of *Moses*, were altered, changed, abrogated, abolished, by the Power and Lordship of Christ alone, *Acts 15.28.* *1 Cor. 12.5.* *Heb. 3.5.6.*

3. Believers have rested, trusted, and depended upon Christ, for spiritual help and supply of grace, according to their needs, *Phil. 4.13.* and *2 Cor. 12.8, 9.* a place worthy consideration, and very convincing, if rightly understood, and duly weighed.

4. Saints have acquiesced, and quietly submitted, and rested satisfied with the will of Christ, and have given up themselves wholly to him to be disposed of, according to his pleasure, whether to do or to suffer, *Act. 9.10.* to *17.* & *2 Cor. 8.5.*

5. Religious praying or prayer for spiritual blessings, as it is an act of Religion, is a service and worship that hath been given to Christ. *Luk. 17.5.* the Disciples pray to Christ to increase their faith. *2 Thess. 2.16, 17.* the Apostle *Paul* prayed to him: and *Hos. 12.4,* *Jacob* of old time wept and made supplication to him.

6. Praife also, as it is an act of Religion, hath been offered up to him, *2 Pet. 2.18.* *Jud. v. 24, 25.* *Rev. 1.6.*

7. Swearing hath been by his Name. *Rom. 9.1,* *Paul* attests Christ, flees to him as a witness, and to his conscience: let the place be weighed, and it will appear to be an Oath; and that the words *in Christ*, as much as *by Christ*; *Isa. 45.23.* compared

with Rom. 14.11. Philip. 2.10.11. And Rev. 10. 5,6, the Angel *sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven and the things therein, and the earth and the things that are therein, and the sea and the things that are therein.* And who is this? It is Christ to whom the Creation is attributed; and to live for ever and ever, is assumed by himself; and he makes himself known by this attribute, as I have shewed before, from Rev. 1.18.

8. In casting of the lot, Christ was invocated for the disposing of it, *Acts 1. 24.* That it was Christ whom they prayed to, appears from hence: 1. They call him *Lord* whom they pray to; which is Christ's usual name in the New-Testament, by which he was distinguished from the Father. 2. To chuse an Apostle, was Christ's proper work: he chose the twelve Apostles, and therefore must chuse him who must come in room and place of *Judas*, who was one of the twelve, and who fell from his Apostleship by transgression: therefore they use it as an argument in their prayer, *Show whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry, from which Judas by transgression fell.* 3. Christ is the great Lord of the Church; and he ascended up on high, that he might give these gifts to his Church, *Apostles, Evangelists, &c. Eph. 4. 10. 11.* And he is the great Lord of all his Churches and administers all such things that respect the good of his Churches, *1 Cor. 12. 5.*

9. The

9. The conscience is subjected to Jesus Christ, *Eph. 6.5,6,7,9.* Masters and servants are enjoyned in this place by the Apostle, to do their duties to each other *with an eye to Christ*, and *as the servants of Christ*, and *as to the Lord, and not to men*, and *as having a Master in heaven, with whom there is no respect of persons*. The Apostle would engage their consciences in the thing, and therefore speaks so much of Christ ; and he could have laid no greater bond upon them, if he had mentioned the Father. See *Col. 3.22,23,24*, where the same bond is laid upon them, with some change of words : he presseth obedience upon servants *with singleness of heart* ; and urgeth them first *with the fear of God*, in stead of mentioning Christ ; and afterward, he fetcheth arguments from Christ, as he had done in his other Epistle.

10. Religious adoration was given to Christ with the body, and never reprehended, but accepted of by him. *Mark 5.22. Luk. 17.16. Job. 11.32. Mark 3.11. Rev. 5.8. Acts 7.59 60.*

And if we have an eye to the manner of worship, we shall finde that Christ required it, and believers give it to him, in such sort as the most high God can onely challenge it.

11. An absolute and universal trust and confidence is put in Christ, such as, that he, who is confessed to be the most high God, can challenge no more ; and this both in the matters of the soul, in

reference to which he is called *the hope of Israel*, *Act. 28.20.* and the person *in whom the Gentiles trust*, *Rom. 15.12.* and also in matters of common providence. *Phil. 2.19.* *I trust in the Lord Jesus, to send Timotheus unto you shortly:* that is, I trust that Christ will so mercifully order it, that I shall send him, and that all impediments will be taken away. And if the providence of Christ doth extend to all things, and that the homage of dependence be given upon this account; what more can be said of the most high God?

2. An absolute and full love is both required and given to Christ; so that God, even the Father, can require no more: *Matth. 10.37,* *He that loveth father, or mother, or son, or daughter, more then me, (saith Christ) is not worthy of me.* But *Luke* expresseth it more fully, *Luk. 14.36.* *He that doth not hate father and mother, wife and children, brethren and sisters, yea and his own life, for Christs sake,* from that dear respect he bears to Christ, *is not worthy of him.* And Christ would draw Peter up to a love above his necessary food: *Lovest thou me* (said Christ) *more then these?* The meat that was before him was meant, the fishes that they were to feed on. And the Spouse was sick of love, *Cant. 5.8.* And what greater proportion can the Father himself require, then what Christ asked, and what the Saints gave to him?

The Inference then must needs be this; Christ is
wor-

worshipped , and honoured, and served , with the worship , and honour, and service, not of an Intermediate object , but of the Principal and Ultimate object : and all such texts which give the same worship to the Son as to the Father, do prove it. And if it were not so , men had need to look to their affiance and affection to Christ , lest it should exceed; and that they neither put their whole trust in Christ, nor set their whole hearts upon him , which would be due to him alone who is the high God , and the principal and ultimate object of these motions of the soul. So that this Doctrine of his doth call off the soul from being too much set upon Christ , as if it were possible to minde him too much, and affect him too dearly : which should make all the true lovers of Christ to abhor it the more.

Objet. There is one knot yet to be untied, before I pass off from this point of Worship. It may be said, Christ is to be worshipped as Mediator : the Scripture is clear and manifest for it ; *Phil. 2. 10,* *At the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow :* here is worship due to Christ, as exalted by the Father : Now he was exalted as he was Mediator , in reference to an Office that he had executed : and being Mediator, he is an intermediate object of worship : for a Mediator is one betwixt God and men , by which men come to God ; and as such an one, Christ is worshipped.

Sol. As Christ is Mediator , he hath a Lordship given

given to him; in which respect he said to be made Lord, as he is made Mediator; and so there is worship belonging to him: But it must be thus understood, That as his Official, Oeconomical, and Mediatorly Lordship was founded in his Natural, Essential Lordship, as he was the Son of God, and the most high God, coessential with the Father, as hath been proved before: so the Worship which he receives as Mediator, as King, Priest, and Prophet of his Church, is founded not simply in or upon the Office, but upon the Excellencie of the person that manageth the Office; and if at all upon the Office, it is because such an Office cannot be executed, but by such a person who is the Son of God, and very God: For if it were possible to conceive how such a Mediatorly function could be performed by one that is not God, Divine religious worship would not be due unto him upon that account. It is the dignity of the Person, that founds the Worship; and the Work doth but quicken to it; or becomes a motive the rather to perform such homage and worship to him to whom it is due upon another account, upon another ground, if that Work had never been. Worship, and honour, and glory, belonged to him, as the second Person in the blessed Trinity, as the Eternal Son of God, and God: and if over and above this glorious (and ever to be honoured and adored) person, become Mediator, it is the more readily and forwardly to be exhibited & given. As every mercie recei-

received from the Father of mercie, becomes a fur-
ther engagement to worship and serve this Father
of mercies ; but the primitive ground is, This Fa-
ther of mercies is God ; otherwise, all mercie,with-
out consideration of the excellencie of the person
from whom it proceeds , is not a right bottom to
found worship upon.

Moses was a Mediator betwixt God and men, and
a Type of this our glorious Mediator, Christ : but
Moses was but a Servant,not a Son;but a Creature,
not God : and there was no religious worship nor
honour that belonged to him , in reference to that
work because a meer creature performed it. And
if it be otherwise in reference to Christ , that Christ
as Mediator deserves to be worshipped ; the reason
is, because such a Mediatorship as Christ per-
formed, could not have been performed , unless Christ
had been God ; because, to execute that Function,
requires the infinite power and wisdom of the God-
head : And therefore *Moses* was the Type of that,
which Christ really, and effectually, and powerfully
was : *Moses* was *internuncius*, one that went be-
twixt God and the people ; but Christ made the
atonement and the peace,being greater then *Moses*;
he being onely typically God, but Christ really and
truely God.

And though Christ be intermediate, being Medi-
ator, yet he would not. could not thence become an
intermediate object of Worship , unless because the
same

same person (though not according to both Natures) is also the principal and ultimate object of it : which shews thus much, That this Worship which Christ the Mediator had, was due upon another account then his Mediatorship ; otherwise it would have been limited and restrained, that that worship which is due to God , who is the ultimate object of worship, might have been discerned from it; and the preeminence the Father hath above Christ in Worship, would have been declared in Scripture.

And hence it follows, that though Christ be an intermediate object of Worship, yet he is the principal and ultimate object also : The same person who is Man and Mediator, is the Son of God & the most high God, & Mediator in that nature also : And if Religious Divine wotship be given unto him as Mediator, it is given unto him for the sake of the Divine Nature & because he is the Son of God, and God ; according to which nature, apart considered from the Humane, he is the ultimate object of worship ; but as considered with the Humane, as Mediator he is the intermediate object of worship. And though the Humane Nature be taken up into the fellowship (as of the Godhead, so) of this honour and worship ; yet this worship is not due, nor doth properly appertain to the Humane Nature : And though the person be honoured with this Divine honour , because of the Union ; yet it is for the sake of the Divine Nature, and not for the sake of the Humane , which ; because

ause it is not the principal and ultimate object of worship ; therefore that very worship, and no lets, nor any other, is given to Christ, being thus intermediate, or Mediator, which is proper and peculiar to God alone, who is the principal and ultimate object worship , cannot (separately and apart considered from the Divine Nature) be any object at all , no not an intermediate object of Religious Divine worship : for then every creature that is a *medium*, or a means , by or through which God communicates himself to men, and so is intermediate betwixt God and man , should be an intermediate object of Divine worship ; which is directly repugnant to the Scripture , and is greatly derogatory to God. that the Manhood of Christ, or the HumaneNature, apart considered, hath but the respect of an instrument, in so glorious a work, which was wrought by the efficiencie and infinite power & wisdom of God.

I have been the larger in discussing this point of Worship , because the right understanding of it will facilitate the discussing of the two next which follow , which respect Faith in Christ. He considers them together ; though I conceive they may well be distinguished from each other , as different things. But I shall follow him in his method.

Instance 2. *If Christ be a meer creature, then it is lawful and warrantable to believe in a meer creature ; which is against the tenour of the whole Scripture : but it is commanded in reference unto Christ, Joh.14.1. and salvation is annexed to it, Joh.3.36.*

In-

Instance 3. If Christ be a meer creature, then faith in a meer creature can save man ; which is absurd and gross, and contrary to the Scriptures : for, Abraham believed God , and it was accounted to him for righteousness, Rom.4.3. and so was saving.

Unto these he opposeth two Propositions, which the Scripture (as he saith) will warrant, and will suffice for an Answer.

1. That that faith which is needful to salvation, hath a double object ; God , and the man Christ Jesus . Joh. 14. 1. which (he saith) the Scripture that I have quoted bears witness to, as a truth.

2. That that faith which is needful to salvation, acts in a divers manner on God , and on the Lord Jesus Christ .

Reply. 1. Neither the Scripture that I have quoted, nor any other, bears witness to this, That the man Jesus Christ, as man, is the object of faith. The Person of Christ that is man, is the object of faith ; but not as man. And the place that he cites in Joh. 3. 14, 15, proves it. *The Son of man shall be lifted up, that whoever believes on him, &c.* But there is in these words that which is called *Idiomatum communicatio* ; viz. that which is spoken in the concrete of Christ according to one Nature , is transferred to another Nature :

ture : And the verse that immediately precedes, *viz.* verse 13. declares thus much : It is said that *the Son of man is in heaven*; which at that time when Christ spake those words, was impossible, as Christ is the Son of man, because Ubiquity, or being everywhere at the same time, is not compatible to any man, as man : but it was meant of the Person of Christ, who is called *the Son of man*, because he was truly man ; but according to the other nature that was in him, *viz.* the Godhead, according to which he was in heaven and on earth together, because he fills both, as God. And Christ, that did put that denomination [*Son of man*] upon himself, in verse 13. continues it, and under that title makes himself the object of faith : but there is a translation of that which is proper to one nature, to another nature to which it is not proper : And indeed, Christ as Mediator is an object of faith ; but it is not as he is man that he is the object, but as he is God : which is very clear, for these Reasons :

1. It is Christ, as he is JEHOVAH, that is the object of faith, as it justifies and saves : *Isa. 45.24.* compared with *Rom. 14.10, 11.* proves it ; Believers are brought in professing their faith in JEHOVAH, which is Christ : *Surely, shall one say, in JEHOVAH have I righteousness and strength.* *1. Tim. 3.19.* *God manifested in flesh, is believed*

on

on in the world : not Christ according to his Manhood.

2. It is Christ as he is all-sufficient, and *able to save to the utmost*, that is the object of faith, *Heb. 7.25.* 2 *Tim. 1.12.* But Christ, as he is man, is not all-sufficient, and able to save to the utmost, but as he is the Son of God, and God, *Joh. 4.25.*

3. The man that trusteth in man, is accursed by God's own sentence, *Jer. 17.5.* Therefore faith is not in Christ as he is man.

4. God hath testified that all life is in his Son, *Joh. 5.11.* and faith must be where life is, and nowhere else ; and therefore not in Christ as man : for the Son of God is not man, but God, as hath been abundantly proved before. And it is also said, verse 12, *He that hath the Son*, that is, hath received him by faith, *Joh. 1.12.* *hath life* ; *and he that hath him not*, *hath not life.* And they are pressed to believe in the Son of God, v.13. that they may have eternal life.

5. Christ himself saith, *Upon this rock*, viz. this profession of faith, that Christ is the Son of God, *he will build his Church*, *Matth. 16.16, 18.* Therefore Christ is the object of faith as he is the Son of God, and not as he is man.

6. If Christ, as mere man, and nothing more, be the object of faith; then any other man or creature whom God sends, and by whom God speaks

or

or acts, may be the object of divine faith ; and so, Moses and the Prophets may be the object of faith ; which is gross.

2. Though God, *viz.* the Father, and Jesus Christ, be two objects of divine Faith, yet it is not true in the sense that he represents it in, *viz.* that they are two objects really distinct from one another ; for the Father that sent the Son Jesus Christ, and the Son Jesus Christ that was sent, are not two distinct Gods, but one God ; they are not two distinct Essences, though they be two distinct substances, or persons ; so the object essentially and really is but one : To this agrees the place which he quotes, *Joh.1 2.44.* *He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.* An Expositor of note puts this sense upon it : *Not on me,* that is, such whom you take me to be, a man, and no more ; but *on me* the Eternal God, and then same in Essence with him that sent me. He puts another sense upon it, saying, *He that believeth one, believeth both, because God appears merciful in the face of Christ, and Christ appears instrumental in the hand of God,* *Rom.4. 24. and 10. 9.* And so he makes Christ an instrument (who could not (as he saith) raise himself from the dead) the object of faith, concerning our Resurrection and Salvation, which is gross ; for Christ is the object of our faith, as he is able to save, not himself onely, but us, to the utmost. And

O

though

though Christ be the Son considered as sent, and as having taken flesh, and as Mediator, and so is the object of faith; yet he is the same person as before he took Flesh, and was Mediator, though under another consideration ; yet the taking of Flesh hath not made him another person, much less another being ; and still he remains the same God with his Father.

And though as he is considered in Flesh, and as Mediator, he be an intermediate object of faith, yet he is also the principal and ultimate object of faith, as he is the Eternal Son, and second person in the Trinity ; for the same person may be both the intermediate and the ultimate object of Faith, under a divers consideration : this was one part of his emptying of himself ; the Son became Mediator in Flesh, and so the intermediate object of faith, who yet was, with the Father, the ultimate Object of it.

And Christ, though he had been Mediator, yet if he had not been God, he could not have been the intermediate Object of Faith, no more then *Moses* was, who was Mediator ; he was not the Object of Faith, nor could be, because he was but a creature. *Moses* was one by whom they beleeved on God, and so were the Prophets, and also the Apostles : *Paul* saith of himself and of *Apollo*, that they were Ministers by whom the *Corinthians* beleeved, *1 Cor. 3.5. Mediums or means by whom they*

they were brought to faith in Christ and God ; but Objects they were not, no not intermediate objects of their Faith ; so Christ could have been but a means of faith in God, if he had been no more but a man, and had not been God.

The brazen Serpent, which was a Type of Christ, to which the promise was made, That who-ever looked up to it, should be healed, (and it was really so; they were healed, as God in the promise said, *Numb. 21. 8, 9.*) was onely a means by which they beleieve in God, being but a creature, and not an intermediate Object of Faith ; they did not beleieve on it at all, but through it, on God ; and so it must have been said of Christ, had he been but a meer creature, had he been but onely the man Jesus Christ.

And though it cannot be denied, but that whole Christ, as consisting of two natures, being God and man, is Mediator, and materially considered is the intermediate Object of Faith ; yet not the whole of Christ is the formal cause of faith in Christ, but the Divinity or Godhead of Christ alone, is the formal cause, and reason, and ground of the faith of Christians in Christ ; for that is the Rock upon which the souls of Saints are built, and a firm, unshaken, unmoveable Rock it is, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against Believers, whose faith doth bottom them upon this Rock.

But he saith, *It is from Gods commandment,*
O 2 *that*

that faith in Christ is needful, Joh.3. 23. And it is from Gods appointment, that faith in Christ is saving, Joh.6.40.

Rep. All faith that justifies and saves, as well that which hath God, *viz.* the Father for its Object, as that which hath Christ for its Object, is by Gods commandment and appointment justifying and saving : for the first Covenant was of Works ; which men brake , and were under death by breaking it; and then came both the commandment of faith, and the promise of life, that was made to faith, *Gal. 3. 8.* *The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, &c.* God freely made choyce of faith, to save men by it, as well of that which respects himself, as that which respects Christ. I hope he will confess that it was by institution that faith in him that sent Christ, *viz.* the Father, is needful and is saving.

But if his meaning be, that no faith was due to Christ naturally, save what is due by vertue of appointment and commandment ; It is utterly untrue, if extended to whole Christ ; for Christ is the natural Essential Son of God; and look what faith was due to the Father, the same faith is due to Christ, as the Eternall Co-essential Son of God.

Or if this sense be given to the words, that there was nothing but a Commandment, that could move

or

or draw to faith in Christ, that is false also; for *Nathanael* was drawn to beleeve without any commandment, that came to him to that purpose, from those beams of his Deity, which sparkled upon him in those words of his. *Before Philip called thee, when thou wast under the Fig-tree, I saw thee;* And many others believed on him when they saw his Miracles; So that not the commandment onely, but his own Almightynes and Infinite Excellency, brought credit and gained faith to him.

The conclusion is this: Though it should be granted, that Faith in the Father and faith in Christ do act in a divers manner (as indeed it must, Christ being considered as Mediator) yet it will not follow, that either in one manner or another Faith doth act upon a creature, but that still the person is God that it acteth upon.

And it is to be observed, that he hath not invalidated that Scripture in *Job.* 14. 1. but it stands in full force still; for though he would have i: to be man. Christ that is there spoken of, yet it cannot be for Christs Argument would not be good in that sence; Ye beleeve in God, therefore beleeve in me a man: there is no good consequence in it: But the Argument is good, Ye beleeve in God the Father, beleeve in me the Son also; for the Father and I are one; ver. 10. *Believeest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me, and that we*

are one God? Therefore seeing ye believed in the Father, believe in me also.

The fourth instance comes now next to be considered of, which is this :

Instance 4. If Christ be but a meer creature, then a meer creature is the Saviour of men, saving them with a mighty and eternal salvation, as the Scripture speaks : but this is against the whole current of the Gospel, which speaks of God our Saviour, Tit. 2. 10, 13. And in many other places.

In answer to this, he saith,

Against this your instance, I shall level this assertion, which will be sufficient to discover its weakness, and confute it; That to affirm Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of men, without God, or equal with God, is contrary to the current of the whole Scripture, which doth distinguish God from Christ in the work of Salvation, calling him a Saviour as distinct from Christ, 1 Tim. 1.1. where God is said to be our Saviour, and the Lord Jesus Christ to be our hope, and in the Text you alledge, and elsewhere frequently.

Rep. To level one assertion against another, is to level Arguments by way of opposition, not to answer

answer Arguments by way of satisfaction: Yea, it is to evade answering by objecting. And it is a sly and crafty way of answering, when there is a knot which is difficult, and perhaps impossible to be untyed, in any Scripture or Argument, to pass it over with silence, and onely propose somewhat which may trouble and perplex the truth in it, or the mind rather of him that reads it. Thus he did in his Answer to the two last Instances, and now again he runs to these fig-leaves to cover the nakedness of his Teneat from that shame which this Argument or Instance enforced with so uncontroulable a Scripture, would cast upon it. But I shall inforce the Scripture alleadged by me, conceiving it will carry conviction along with it to the hearts of such who shall duly perpend and consider it; and afterwards shew the weaknes of his assertion.

In this Scripture of *Tit. 2. 10, 11, 13.* the Apostle speaks of Christ all along: in *v. 10.* he calls the doctrine of the Gospel, the Doctrine of our Saviour God. So it is in the Original, "*Ινα των διδασκαλιαν της σωτηρίας υἱοῦ Θεοῦ κοσμάσιν.* That they may adorn the Gospel of our Saviour God: in *v. 11.* he speaks of the same God Christ: for by the grace of God, he means the Gospel of grace, or the Doctrine of Grace, which he had in the former verse called the Doctrine of our Saviour God. This Doctrine or Gospel hath appeared unto all

open : in ver. 13, he stiles Christ the blessed hope, which is elsewhere made the title of God, *Rom.* 15. 13. & *Pet.* 1. 21. And he puts the denomination of the great God and our Saviour upon Christ. It is not *a great God*, without an article, as he al-leadged to evade the strength of *Job.* 1. 1. But it is *the great God*, with an Article. This Text I pre-sented among the Scriptures which I produced, and it was the third in order ; but he passed over it then, promising to speak to it when he should give in his an-swer to another Paper ; and here he takes no no-tice of it neither : What may be the reason ? but because he is not able to pre-sent any thing which can clould and darken the bright evidence of it ; for it witnesseth two things with great clearness, 1. That Christ is God, great God, the great God, or that one great God. 2. That Christ, though he be man as well as God, yet he is Saviour chiefly and especially as he is God, and not as he is man ; For, considered as God, he is able to save to the ut-most. As he is man, there are actions done by him, and sufferings born, by which men are saved ; but the vertue, force, efficacie, and valour of both the one and other, are as he is God.

And he saveth with the Father as the principal efficient, *Isa.* 45. 21. *I am a just God and a Sa-viour, and there is none beside me.* This is the person that took flesh, that thus speaks. It is clear from *Rev.* 14. 10, 11, that it is Christ ; but the Father

Father is not excluded ; and the meaning is , there is none other God that saves, but what Christ is : Because the Father , and Christ, and the Spirit, are one principal efficient that saves.

It is further confirmed, *Hos.1.7. I will save them by Jehovah their God:* it is the speech of Jehovah the Father , concerning Jehovah the Son, whom he calls their God ; and promiseth them to save by him. And it must not be understood that this salvation is instrumentally effected , because it is said, *I will save them by, &c.* For, the titles given to the person by whom the Father will save, do shew that he is not an instrument. Is Jehovah their God but an instrument in saving ? Is one Jehovah instrumental to another ? or is it onely the order of working betwixt the Father and the Son ? Are there two Jehovahs , and both of them our God ? *Moses tells Israel, Jehovah our God is our Jehovah;* for Essence one , though two in persons, *Deut.60.4.* The order then betwixt the persons is onely to be observed and acknowledged , not any superiority or inferiority in working.

But let me consider his assertion.

To affirm Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of men without God, or equal with God, is contrary to the current of Scripture. Thus he.

But against what expressions of mine is this assertion

servation levelled ? I have affirmed that whoever saves, must be God ; therefore Christ, because he saves, must be God. But where have I said that Christ saves without God ? To save as God, and to save without God, are these two one thing ? Or are they not rather repugnant and contrary to one another ? But suppose (as it must needs be) that by God he means the Father, I have not asserted that Christ saves without the Father, by way of efficiency, but the Father saves by the Son, Christ Jesus, and the Son saves from the Father : But I assert them to be equals in saving, notwithstanding this order betwixt them : for it is but one God that saves, though in diversity of persons ; and this one God cannot be superior and inferior to himself. And all the confirmation that he himself gives of his own Position, is this, That God in Scripture is distinguished from Christ, in the work of Salvation ; and he quotes, *I Tim. i. 1.* where God is said to be our Saviour, and the Lord Jesus is only said to be our hope : But this hath no strength in it ; for in *Tit. i. 4.* God hath not the title of Saviour given unto him, when he is mentioned with Christ, but hath the relative title of Father only given him ; but Christ is called Saviour, and is distinguished from God by that name. Is therefore God, *viz.* the Father, less a Saviour, or an unequal Saviour to Christ, because Christ, and not he, is called a Saviour ? And is not Christ called both

both the blessed hope, and the great God our Saviour? Are not both titles put upon him, as due to him? And though they are used by the Apostle to distinguish the persons of Father and Son from each other when they are spoken of together, yet both these are applied to both persons, and are proper to him alone, that is the most high God.

But he saith,

Scripture doth prefer God in the work of salvation before our Lord Jesus Christ, making him to be the principal Agent therein, when it declares that the work of Christ in saving, was from the purpose of God, who appointed him for it; from the precept of God, who enjoyned him to it; and from the presence of God, who assisted him in it.

Reply. But where doth Scripture witness this of God the Father, in reference to the whole of Christ? He saith, Scripture doth abundantly set forth all these; but he doth not quote any one place for proof of them, but would have us receive it upon his word. That God purposed to save by Christ, considered as David's and Mary's son, considered according to his Manhood; that God enjoyned him as such, that God assisted him as such (God being taken essentially and properly, for Father, Son, and holy Ghost; and not im-

improperly and personally, for the Father) will be granted ; and it will be plentifully made out by Scripture : but that the Father purposed without the Son and holy Ghost, and commanded and enjoyned without the Son and holy Ghost, and assissted without the Son and holy Ghost ; this is denied. For as the Father without the Son and holy Ghost made not man, but the Trinity sate in Council ; *Let us make man* : so it was in the work of Salvation ; it was an act of Council : The Father gave the Son, and the Son gave himself, emptied himself : every Person concurred and wrought in the work, so far as concerns efficiencie : All decreed it, all acted in it, as one principal Agent ; and onely the Humanity of Christ was Instrumental.

And if we consider the Material and Meritorious cause of mens salvation, God the Father, or God in the person of the Father, is far from being the Principal cause thereof ; for he is no cause at all : for the Father took not flesh upon him, nor was Mediator either of Satisfaction or Intercession ; he made not the Atonement ; but this was the Son's sole work, he did all in it ; he was the person that was *made of a Virgin*, and was *made under the Law* ; he was the person that was *made flesh*, and *manifested in flesh* ; and hath a peculiar right, in this respect, to the denomination of *Saviour*. And though all was
acted

acted and endured in and by the flesh that he assumed : for he bare our sins on his body on the tree ; yea, and in his soul also , when he cried out, *My God, my God, &c.* in such manner ; yet if that flesh had not been supported by the Godhead of the Son , which assumed it , it would have been crumbled to dust and powder by that weight of wrath that lay upon it : So that it was by the vertue and power of the Godhead , that such actings and such sufferings were ; and all was accounted as done and suffered by the Son , though the Son , as the Son , was not capable of it , but by assuming flesh into the unity of his person ; and so it came to be reckoned as his work ; and it was in account as if the *Lord of glory* had been crucified , and as if the *blood of God* had been spilt , and the merit was from the excellencie of the person of the Son , that did and suffered all .

But he further saith,

That the Scripture revealeth the Lord Christ to be in the work of salvation but an instrumental Saviour. For this, (saith he) see Tit. 3. 4, 5, 6. which puts it past all question. But after that the kindness and love of God and our Saviour towards man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the

the holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Reply.

Here is in these words of his,

First, A bold assertion, *viz.* That Scripture revealeth Christ to be but an instrumental Saviour.

Secondly, A peremptory Conclusion, that *Tit. 3. 4, 5, 6.* puts it out of question.

Thirdly, A defective and insufficient probation, or confirmation; he alledgedeth the words of the Text as if they did carry with them conviction of what he asserts in the very letter of them, when as there is no such matter.

1. Scripture is so far from revealing such a thing of Christs instrumentality, that it reveals the contrary to it: in *Heb. 1.3.* it is said, *That Christ by himself purged away our sins;* but of any instruments can it be said that by himself he doth any thing? Doth an instrument act by himself, that is, by his own vertue and sufficiency? and by himself, that is, without the power of the principal efficient? Is an Instrument any thing out of the hand of the chief Agent? Also in *Heb. 7.25.* it is said, *That Christ is able to save to the utmost;* But is any Instrument able to save to the utmost? Hath he the ability within himself? So that it may be said of him,

him, that he is able? What greater thing can be predicated of the principal efficient, or chief Agent, then that he is able to save to the utmost? This is too high an expression for an Instrument. And in *Psal. 89. 19*, it is said of Christ (whom *David typified*) that God had *laid help upon one that was mighty*. If Christ be onely but an Instrument, what needs he to be mighty in himself? for every Instrument, if it be mighty through the might of another (as the *Rams horns* were) it is sufficient. What needed the choice of a mighty one, if the Saviour be onely instrumental? The weaker the Instrument, the more honour will the Principal Efficient have. The excellencie of Power is known to be of God, when the instrumental means is Weakness and Foolishness. Why also could not the blood of Goats have cleansed the Conscience, but the Blood of JESUS CHRIST, God's Son, was necessary, if an Instrument may be a Saviour? Doubtless, a word of Institution would have made the one as effectual as the other.

But indeed, there is no might that any creature-Instrument is capable to be recipient or the subject of, that can save to the utmost, because it requires an infinite power to conquer Sin and Satan, Death and Hell; to abolish them, and to bring Life and Immortality to light; to

to effect a first and second Resurrection for men who were to be saved.

Secondly, The Scripture that he alleadgeth out of *Titus* 3. 3, 4, , hath no such thing engraven upon it, as he produceth it for ; such that *he that runs may read* it written there, or he that reads may understand without questioning, that whole Christ is but an Instrument.

For all that is asserted by the Apostle, is, that God the Father our Saviour, saved through Christ our Saviour, by the holy Ghost. And what doth this hold out, but the Order among the Persons in their working ? And when J E H O V A H saves by J E H O V A H their God, doth this particle [*by*] import instrumentalnes ? I have shewed the contrary.

Indeed, the Manhood of Christ is made instrumental to the Godhead of Christ, and to the whole Trinity, in this great designe of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, to save men ; but it cannot in this place be applied to the Manhood, because the Spirit is shed or given from the Father, through Christ, not as Man, but as God, as I have shewed in the other Treatise.

In-

Instance 5. The 5. Instance he forms up into an Argument, thus, That Doctrine which makes the Mediator betwixt God and man, to be a meer creature, brings in (as it were) another Gospel; destroyes the true Gospel in many of the parts of it, &c. in that it is against reason, that the Mediator should be a creature, because a meer creature is no way meet to be a Daysman for God. & because a Mediator must either partake of both God and man, or of neither, else he will be rather a party, then a Mediator, &c. and in that it opposeth these Scriptures, Mat. 1. 23. 1. Tim. 3. 16. Joh. 1. 14. But that Doctrine which denies Jesus Christ to be the most high God, makes the Mediator betwixt God and man to be a meer creature. Therefore I shall passe by all those lines in which he only trifles, & speaks not to the Argument or instance, and mention only that which is materiall, in way of answer.

To the Major, and the first reason of it, viz: A meer creature is no way meet to be a Daysman for God, He answers thus;

This reason wants a reason to support it; what should hinder (saith he) but the meere creature may be a Daysman or Mediator? Is there any one work that belongs to his office, that is impossible for a creature to perform, notwithstanding divine assistance with him? I dare, saith he, affirme the contrary, and am able to prove in whatsoever work you can instance in, belonging to Christs Mediatorship, that of himself he was not able to perform it, unless by

*the assistance of another, which he enjoyed, and so
is a compleat Mediator:*

Rep. There are many things that may hinder, that a meere creature cannot be a Daysman, or Mediator for God : 1. The disproportion that is betwixt God and a meere creature hinders , which disproportion is infinite. It is against Gods honor and glory, that God should admit of a meer creature-Daysman or Mediator : It is as if a worm should be a Daysman or Mediator for a man; or as if a begger should be a Daysman or Mediator for a King. Nay there is not any thing to resemble it by among all the creatures ; and there would be too much honour put upon a meer creature , if he should be Mediator or Daysman, because a meer creature is infinitely below God; but a Daysman should hold some kind of equality with the person for whom he is a Daysman :For 1. The matter is committed to him that is a Daysman or Mediator. 2. The person that commits the matter to the Daysman, commits himself with it to him also. 3. A Daysman is one that must judge betwixt : now this is too low for God to admit of, and too high for man, or for any meer creature, that it should be set n such a place. 2. The impotency and infirmity of the creature hinders that it cannot be a tmeet Daysman for God : For 1. No meer creature can attain unto a perfect knowledge of the trespass and offence that is committed against

against God, because it is infinite; therefore no finite creature can search into it, the person against whom it is committed being infinite, makes it infinite; and one of a finite knowledge cannot reach it: it may be truly said, that neither man nor Angel, nor the Son of man himself; as man, knowes the greatnessse of mans sin: for unlesse the greatnessse of God can be measured, against whom it was committed, the greatnessse of the sin cannot be known. Now if it cannot be known by any meer creature, then no meere creature can be a Daysman to consider of it.

2. No meer creature can be sufficiently sensible of the great dishonour that was offered unto God, and the great indignity and injury that was done against God, when man sinned again him; for what is all creature-sense, to that infinite perception which God hath of the affront done unto him; and unlesse you could make the creature as God, a creature cannot have the feeling of God; and unlesse a creature had the infinite holinesse of God, a creature cannot know how distastfull sin is unto God; therefore a meer creature cannot be a Mediator or Daysman for God; for he cannot sensibly enough consider of the transgression against God.

3. No meer creature can make Proposalls that are proportionable, in reference to Gods honour, that was impaired by the sin of man, that God might be no loser, nor might receive any

detriment by Mediation ; because no creature knowes how much the honor of God is impaired, and if he did, yet it would be beyond his power to offer honorable terms to God in reference thereto, for a creature will act and move like a creature, and all its Proposalls will be low and little, and defective and short, yea infinitely low & short, and like it self, therefore a meer creature cannot be a meet Daysman for God, because he will be sure to wrong him. 4. The Mediator betwixt God and man. is not of intercession onely, but of satisfaction ; now no meer creature can give satisfaction for mens offences, because offences are greater then can be conceived of, & the satisfaction must be like them, that is, must be greater then can be imagined by any creature, therefore greater then can be given by any creature. The Mediator is an undertaker to satisfie for what is past by paying the utmost farthing, and to render man a new creature, inclined and devoted to God, who was before an enemy. Now no meer creature can be such an undertaker, because he cannot give a price sufficient nor work any such transformation in man, but it belongs to him who made heaven and earth to do this.

These things are impediments why a meer creature cannot be a Daysman betwixt God and men, there are things to be known and done which creatures, as creatures, are not capable of.

His

His daring therefore to assert the contrary, shews rather his presumption then his wisdom or ability.

And whereas he saith, that he is able to prove that Christ of himself was not able to perform any work belonging to his Mediatorship, unlesse by the assistance of another, which he enjoyed, and so was a compleat Mediator.

It is utterly untrue and repugnant to the Scripture, for by himself he purged away our sins, *Heb. 1.3.* and herein he debaseth Christ not a little, he makes him as weak as one of us, and he concurses with those enemies of Christ in their reproaches which they cast upon him when he was upon the Crosse, he brings in the same verdict with them, yea, he hath meaner thoughts in some kind, then they, *he saved others* (said they) *but himself he cannot save*, that is, by his own power, he cannot, for otherwise they knew God could save him; the Apostle had not so high thoughts of him, but he hath as low thoughts, I am able, said the Apostle, to do all things through Christ strengthening me, but by faith, Christ himself is able to do nothing, without the Fathers strengthening of him. If this be true which he asserts, that Christ is able to perform nothing of himself without assistance of another: God might then have saved by Peter or Paul, or James or John, or any man else, whom

he would have looked upon in reference to that work as by Christ. Is such a Mediator as he deciphers Christ to be (so poore, so empty as he makes him to be, not able to do anything in discharge of that office he is designed to of himself without assistance) a meer object of the faith, and hope of the Saints?

If he had asserted this of the humane nature of Christ, that it was able to do nothing by way of satisfaction in the function of Mediatorship of it self, without the assistance of the Divinity, or Godhead of Christ, it had been an undeniable truth; but to assert this of whole Christ, in whom the fullnesse of the Godhead dwelt bodily, or substantially, and essentially, and in whom are hid all the treasures, all the mines of wisdom, and knowledge, and all excellency; and in whom are all unsearchable riches, this is such a vilifying of him, that it is a second crucifying of him, and it is not his boasting of being able to prove it that makes the evil the lesse, but it is the more horrid by how much he is confident. This Doctrine must needs weaken faith, & hope, and affiance in Christ, and indeed if it were so (as he saith) that we had such a Mediator, so impotent and so weak, of all creatures we were most miserable.

But he proceeds, and attempts to break the strength of the second reason which I produced to prove, that a meer creature-Christ could not be

be Mediator betwixt God and men, which was this.

Because a Mediator must either partake of both God and man, or of neither, else he will rather be a party then a Mediator.

To this he answers thus,

Was not Moses a Mediator betwixt God and men, but was Moses God and man? Gal. 3.19.

Rep. Moses was a typicall Mediator, and was that mystically, and figuratively, which Christ was really and truly: Moses was not God and man, but man onely essentially and substantiallly, yet he was as God to Aaron, and to the people, Exod. 4. 16. God reputatively he was, and representatively; and this was sufficient for him that was not that true Mediator, but the shadow of him: but he that was shadowed out, and is no shadow, but Mediator indeed and in truth, he must be God indeed, and in truth: And this Argument of his fetched from Moses, is strong against him, it is like that of Melchisedech, produced to prove the eternity of Christ, upon which I have insisted more largely, the sinews of which no humane strength can cut asunder.

But he saith, *When I brought this reason, I knew not what I did, for it gives witnessse against me.* And he argues against me by the help of the reason which I have produced. I said, if Christ were not God as well as man, he would rather

ther be a party then a Mediator, and he thence disputes against me thus.

If Christ the Mediator were God he was a party, but Christ the Mediator was not a party, therefore Christ the Mediator was not God.

Rep. The Major Proposition how clear soever it is to him, is notwithstanding unsound, and untrue in it self, for there is a twofold Mediator, there is *Mediator participationis*, and *Mediator negationis*; a Mediator of participation, and a Mediator of negation, that is, a Mediator, that partakes of both, and a Mediator that partakes of neither. If there be a breach betwixt the father and the mother, and a child comes betwixt and mediates, the child stands related alike to both of them, and partakes equally of both of them, and is a Mediator of participation: If there be a breach betwixt two neighbours, and a third neighbour comes in and Mediates, he stands in relation to neither of them, nor partakes of either of them, he is a Mediator of negation, neither the one nor the other is any thing to him; neither of these Mediators are parties: the latter is not by his own confession, and it is as clear that the former is not, for he is not properly a party that partakes of both, but he that partakes not of both, or at least, not of both alike, but partakes of the one, and not of the other, or partakes more of the one, then of the other; for disparity

disparity of relation in the Mediator to the persons betwixt whom he mediates, makes the Mediator a party, and not parity and equality. If there should be a difference betwixt two brethren, and a third brother come in betwixt them to mediate and make peace, he is not a party, or if he be, he is a party to both, and a party to both, is in proper manner of speaking a party to neither; but if there be a controversie between two half brothers, and another comes in to mediate who is a whole brother to one of them, he is rather a party then a Mediator, because he stands not in so near a relation to the one, as to the other.

The application is easie, Christ is a Mediator betwixt God and man, not of negation but of participation, for a man he is (without all controversie betwixt him and me) and in all things like to us, sinne onely excepted, and if he be a man, then he partakes of man; and partaking of man, he calls men his brethren, *Heb.2.11.* and if he should not partake of God equally, as he doth of man, and stand in like relation to God, as he doth to man, he would be a party rather than a Mediator, but being God as well as man, he is no party, but a Mediator, or a middle person in a proper acceptation, not negatively, but relatively, standing in equality of relation without any disparity; and in this sense, it would be true, (as he saith) that if

if Christ were God, he would be a party, if he were not man also as well as God, for then then there would be a disparity, and inequality of relation in Christ the Mediator, in reference to the one of the persons betwixt whom he mediates; he would be more nearly allied to the one, then to the other, more to God than to man: but as he frames the Argument, if Christ the Mediator be God, then he is a party, when as it is manifest that he is man also, & no nearer related to God, though he be God, than he is to man because he is man: the Major is palpably false, & must be denied: by that time he hath seriously considered of this, which I have here presented, I hope he will be forced to confess, that I knew what I did when I brought that reason, that Christ, if a mere creature, would be a party rather than a Mediator. But he gives an instance.

In reconciliation (saith he) by a Mediator, we are to suppose three: One offended, another offending, and a third mediating for peace betwixt them. God was offended, men were offenders, and Christ was the Mediator. Now if Christ had been a sinfull man, he had been of the party offending; and if he had been God, he was the party offended; but Christ was not a Party: From the Proposition which I have thus confirmed, and the Assumption which you have acknowledged, I will draw up this Conclusion, That Christ the Mediator is not God.

Rep. In this Instance, and in the application
of

of it, there are some things that are justly liable to exception, and other things manifestly false. 1. That there be three in reconciliation wil be granted, but that the third must be so distinct as he holds it forth, as not to partake of the other two, is denied: For, a son that mediates betwixt father and mother (which may sometimes be the case) is of the flesh of both, and yet notwithstanding is distinct from both but not so distinct as not to partake of both. So in the reconciliation made by Christ betwixt God and man, there are three that are distinct: 1. There is God offended: 2. There is man, *viz.* mankind, offending: 3. There is Christ mediating, who is neither meerly and only God; nor yet meerly man; but is both God and man, yet distinct from both God and man: Distinct from God because he is man, and distinct from man because he is God. Yea there is yet a further distinction; for, Christ though he be man, *viz.* of that kind, for nature and essence, which was the offending party, yet not one of those persons in that kind, that did offend, but without sin himself; and though he be God, and so for essence and nature one with that party which was offended, and was offended in his own person, yet distinct in personality, or (which is all one) a distinct person from the Father and the Holy Ghost, who more visibly do manage the offence against man. For the Son, though he was offended,

ded, together with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, yet he appears not prosecuting the offence, but therein he is veiled, and appears only appeasing the Father that was offended : in both these respects there are three in this busynesse of reconciliation.

But he makes mention of three in reconciliation, which in titles and names are the same with the three which I have already spoken of ; viz. God, men, & Christ : But when he comes to open and unfold these three, he makes the third, which mediates betwixt the other two, to be so distinct from both of them, as to partake of neither of them : And under this lies couched the poysen and malignancy of his doctrine ; For, as he layes it down, he not only denies the God-head of Christ (which is the doctrine in dispute betwixt us) but he destroyes the Manhood also, and overturnes that satisfaction, which in the nature of man he gave for man ; for his words are these, *If Christ had been a sinfull man, he had been of the party offending* : His designe is to shew, that he was a distinct person, & partaked of neither Party betwixt whom he mediated ; *He was not of the Party offending, for he was not a sinfull man* ; *He was not the Party offended for he could not be God, because he could not be a Party* : Let it be considered seriously what he saith, and it will be found to be false and dangerous, and reacheth not his own designe.

i. False,

1. False, for was Christ therefore not of that Party, because he was without sin? Was he not a true man in all things like other men, sin onely excepted? Had he not a true Body and Soule? Was not soule and body subject to the same infirmities and weaknesses (sin excepted) as other mens soules and bodies were? Was he not the Seed of the Woman which was promised? Was he not conceived in the womb of the Virgin, and was flesh of her flesh? Was he not *Abrahams* seed, and *Davids* seed? Was not Satan to be broken and destroyed in all his strength by one that must be of the Woman, that must spring out of her, and be her seed? And should all this be, and yet Christ not this Party? He was no offender indeed, but yet he was of that Party which did offend, he had the same nature for essence: *Abraham* was of that Party which offended, and so was *David*, and were offenders themselves, and he was their seed, and was of them and from them; therefore it is a great untruth and grosse mistake to say that he was not of that Party; for he was flesh of their flesh, and bone of their bone, but kept by the Holy Ghost from that naturall pollution and staine which defiled them.

2. Dangerous; for if Christ were not of that party that offended, he could not satisfie for that party which offended; for in the same nature in which the offence was committed, must the

the satisfaction be given; for both the justice and truth of God required this. It was threatened that the soule, that is the person that sins, shall die, and if another suffer that penalty, yet it must be one in that nature; therefore it is said, he bore our sins on his own body on the tree: It was necessary it should be so, else the truth of God would not be fulfilled, nor justice satisfied. And if Christ be not of the offending party, if he be another from them, not partaking of them, but be of another nature, and not of theirs, then he might as well have been no man at all, for any fruit or benefit that accrues to sinfull man thereby: And Christ might as well have taken the nature of Angells, and as much to the benefit of lost men, as have assumed flesh, if it be not the flesh and nature of men, that did offend, if he be not of their party, though not spotted with their sin.

3. It reacheth not his own designe, which is to make Christ a third and distinct person or party, from those he mediates betwixt, partaking of neither; for he knowes, that if it be confessed, that Christ partakes of the nature of one of the parties whom he is to make peace betwixt, and not of the other, then he will undeniably be a party instead of a Mediator: to avoid therefore this, he holds that he partakes of neither; and yet he makes Christ a man notwithstanding, but not a man of the offending party,

party. But this distinction will not help him, for if he be a man, for substance and essence like o- them , he is nearer related to them as such, then he is to God, if he be not God ; and then he will be a party still, rather then a Mediator. For a party is one that partakes more of the one then of the other.

Lastly, Suppose that to be (which he disputes a- gainst) as a thing very absurd, viz. that Christ were of the party offended, and were also of the party offending , as in truth and deed Christ is , though not in the sense that he understands it, yet the consequence is naught , that he must therefore be a party; for a party to both makes him a party to neither above other, and so not a party at all, but an unbyassed Mediator betwixt both ; by all which, his much weaknesse, accom- panied with much confidence, is manifest to the intelligent.

In the next place he considers of the Scrip- tures which I produced, to prove the Mediator to be more then a meer creature, viz. the high God: and first,

I made use of the title that is given to Christ, *He is called Immanuel, which is God with us, or God in our nature, Mat. 1.23.* His Answer is ;

Immanuel was not the name of Christ, but a sig- nification of his name Jesus, which (saith he,) is mani- fest if we compare the 21,22, and 23.verses toge- ther. Now the name Jesus signifies not the nature,

but the office of Christ, as the Angell expounds ver. 21. thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins; and so Immanuel notes out that certain aid that God would affoord by Jesus Christ to his Church.

Rep. *Immanuel and Jesus are not one and the same name, nor have they one and the same interpretation? nor doth the name Immanuel interpret the name Jesus, nor doth Mat. I. 21. 22, 23. shew any such thing: all that can be collected is this,* 1. *That both the names do belong to Christ, he that is Immanuel is also Jesus.* 2. *That these two names do so necessarily imply one the other, that they cannot be separated, therefore the Prophet (speaking of his birth) saith, his name shall be called Immanuel, and the Angel, speaking of his birth, saith, his name shall be called Jesus, alluding therein to the Prophet, because Christ is first Immanuel, and afterward Jesus, and he was Immanuel, that he might be Jesus, and he could not be Jesus, unless he were Immanuel; this is the cause, and that is the effect, and he that denies him to be Immanuel, denies him to be Jesus: therefore the Angel stiles him by the name, that is, the effect, and then sends us to consider of the name, which is the cause, which the Prophet gives him.*

Now whereas he saith, the name Jesus signifies not the nature, but the office of Christ, as the Angel expounds it, ver. 21. This shews, that the

the name *Immanuel* is not the signification of the name *Jesus*, for *Immanuel* doth import not office, but nature, or natures in Christ, *viz.* the divine and humane nature united into one person, which other Scriptures make manifest, which I have already quoted, in *John* 1.14.1 *Time*: 3.16. and others may be added, *Phil.* 2.6.7. *be
b eing in the form of God emptied himself and came
in the form of a servant, and Heb.2.16. he took not
the nature of Angells, but the seed of Abraham, and*
Col. 3.9. *In him dwelleth all the fullnesse of the
Godhead bodily,* such Scriptures as these serve to interpret the name *Immanuel*, & do declare that it doth denote two natures in Christ, *viz.* the divine and humane. For if it should onely import divine help, & aid reached out unto us, then every believer might carry that name as well as Christ, because God doth reach out grace and favour, and assistance to each Saint: But without doubt because there was a breach betwixt God and us through sin, & we were driven from God, and God became a stranger to us, *Col.* 1.18. therefore the Lord would give a sign, as it is expressed in *Isa.* 7.14. in Christ whom he would send, of a reunion and conjunction betwixt himself and us; we shall behold God & man united together a man in Christ, that we may not be faithlesse but believe, we shall know that he will dwell with us; For he shall visibly dwell in Christ to our conviction. So that there are two reasons

Q

why

why Christ is called Immanuel. 1. Because he is both God and man in one person. 2. Because he is the bond of that conjunction, that is to be betwixt God and us ; but withall it doth import that reconciliation which he effects as Mediator betwixt God and us, giving himself a ransome that our sins might be remitted, and we might be accepted again into favour ; and if this be the certain aid that he speaks of, which comes by Christ to the Church, he is so far right, but yet reacheth not the root of the matter ; for this aid is from the mightinesse of his person. If God had not united with our nature, our nature could never have united with God : but God came down to us, and in the person of Christ gave evidence to us that he was God with us.

The next Scripture which he undertakes to answer, is 1 Tim. 3.16. *without controversie great is the mystery of godlinessse, God was manifest in the flesh.*

His answer is, *Ancient Interpreters (saith a learned man) as the Latine, the Syriack, the Arabick, Ambrose and Augustine make this reading to be suspected, for they read not as we do, for thus they read the words, And without controversie great is the mystery of godlinessse, which mysterie was manifested in the flesh.*

Rep. It is true, that such a reading is found, but saith Beza upon the place, *repugnant perpetuo consensu*

sensu omnes Graci codices, that is, all the Greek copies are with one consent against it: And a little before he saith, *vix alius locus est in quo omnia redēptionis nostrae mysteria, vel magnificē us vel planius explicentur, ut non mirum sit fœde fusse à diabolo depravatum*, that is, There is hardly such an other place to be found, in which all the mysteries of our redēption are unfolded either so magnificently or plainly as in this, so that it is no wonder if this text have been foully corrupted and depraved by the devill.

But if the word Θεός Cod , be left out, and the article & be put in instead of it, and so the words run thus, Great is the mystery of godlinnesse, which is manifest, is the flesh, why doth he not improve this reading to his own purpose, and interpret what is meant by the mystery which is manifest in the flesh, and make the rest of the words to concurre with it, that he may gain credit to such a reading? Alas he knows very well the following words will not quadrare, they will not correspond nor suit with such a reading.

By the word *mystery* there are (who follow this reading) that understand the Gospell, which is called a *mystery*, but was the Gospell manifested in the flesh, &c. and received up into glory? certainly it must be meant of some person, that was in flesh, and was received up to glory; therefore if it be the mystery that was manifested

fested in the flesh, and received up into glory, it was not the Gospell, for the Gospell is the glad tydings of good things in Christ; and was the glad tydings of good things in Christ manifest in the flesh, and were glad tydings received up into glory? it is absurd to be asserted.

If he understand any thing else by Mystery, which was manifested in the flesh then the Gospell, it must be the soul of Christ, which he saith was created before the rest of the creatures, and which in time took flesh, and was manifested in the flesh; but was it so great a Mystery for the soul to come into the body after the body is formed in the womb? is it not that which is done every hour in the formation of man? doth not the soul unite with the body in the generation of all that are born in the world.

And indeed though he grant our reading, yet he brings all to this, for his words are,

It is not denied but that Christ was a God, and the Text saith but this, a God was manifested in the flesh, that is (saith he) appeared visible amongst men, when he took unto him a body.

Rep. If Christ was a God before he took flesh, then he was ever a God from the first that he was, and that was (by his own concession) before there was any creature created, and consequently before any actuall Sovereignty was bestowed upon him; for that could not be before the world had an actuall existence, over which

which he was to have his actuall Soveraignty, and then it will follow that he was God by nature from all eternity with the Father and the Holy Ghost, but this I have discusst before; that which I shall add is this, look what a God Christ was, such a God he was in flesh, but Jehovah he was, the mighty God he was, the great God he was, the true God he was, the everlasting God he was, God over all blessed for ever he was, subsisting in the form or nature of God he was, and equall with God, such a God he was as is abundantly testified in Scripture, therefore such a God he was manifested in flesh.

As for *Hincmarus* his conceipt, that this word *God* was put into the Text by the Nestorians, I have him not by me, and I much heed it not, because the very Text it self gives witnesse to it self, that the word is not added by mans device or fraud, for if it be left out, the rest of the words are made nonsense thereby.

The third and last Scripture that I made use of to prove Christ as Mediator, not to be a meer creature, and nothing else, was this.

It is said in Joh. i. 14. *The Word was made Flesh.*

His Answer is, *The creature that was immediatly made by God, took unto it a body.* I find no place (saith he) where the flesh of Christ signifies anything more then his body, according to which he died,

died, and is no where taken for the humane nature.

Rep. This conceipt of a creature immediatly made by God, which took unto it a body, hath been at large spoken to, and confuted in my former Treatise: It hath also been the word , that the word Flesh is taken Synechdochically for humane nature, a part being put for the whole. I find no cause to add any thing either to the one or other, but shall consider of the Reasons which he leaves me to pause upon, by which he would prove Christ the Mediator to be a meer creature.

Let me oppose (saith he) your Proposition with two or three Reasons.

Rea.1. Because whole Christ is a creature, if so, then either a meer creature is Mediator, or Christ is not a Mediator.

Rep. The greater part of my former Treatise is spent in the confuting of this assertion, I therefore think it needless to spend more time or strength about it, especially seeing he refires to what he said before, and brings no new strength to it.

Rea.2. Because a Mediator is not of one, Gal.3. 20. Now if Christ be God, then he is a Mediator of one; for he cannot be a Mediator to himself , and there is but one God.

Rep. It is true (as the Apostle saith) that a Mediator is not of one, that is, not of one Party, for

a Mediators work is to make peace; now it is to be alwaies supposed, that no one is at variance with himself, therefore a Mediator is not of one, but of two Parties that dissent the one from the other, which Parties are God and Man.

But his deduction which he fetcheth from this saying is faulty, which is this, If Christ be God, then is he a Mediator of one, for he cannot be a Mediator to himself, and God is but one: if this were a sound consequence, Christ would be Mediator to none at all, and the reason is this, There are but two Parties disagreeing, God and man: Now all the Elect in all the world they are reckoned in this account but as one man; Now if Christ be man, took their seed, then he is of this Party, then he is Mediator to himself, and the words may be retorted, A Mediator is not of one; but if Christ be man, then he is a Mediator of one, for he cannot be Mediator to himself, for all men are but as one, come under one consideration, and he is among them; if he be a man being of their nature, and true man of their seed.

Therefore there must be a distinction made concerning Christ; Christ may be considered φυσικῶς or οἰκονομικῶς, either in his nature & person, as he is the second in the Trinity, and the essentiall Son of God, or in reference to his Office, as he is God in flesh, and King, Priest, and Prophet to

the Church, and appointed Daysman; and if this latter acceptance, he is not Mediator to himself, though he be God, for he is God-man, and so differs from himself, considered *nude*, as God, or the second person in the Divine Trinity; that which was asserted before concerning this man also considered.

Rea. 3. His third reason is the same for substance with the second, *Because* (saith he) *Christ is a Mediator betwixt God and man*, 1 Tim. 2.5. *Now if he were God, he could not be a Mediator betwixt God and men*, for *he could not be a Mediator to himself*.

This hath been considered in the former reason, only there is thus much new in it which deserves consideration: *Timothy* (saith he) *calls the Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ*.

Let the whole text in that place of *Tim.* be considered and ducly weighed, together with the Apostles scope and design, and with the observation of a learned man upon it, and it will prove Christ to be both God and man, and Mediator betwixt God and man, for the words in the Greek run thus, *εἰς γὰς Θεὸς, εἰς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπῳ Χειρὶ Ἰησοῦς*: which may be thus rendred, *For the man Christ Jesus is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man.* There may be these reasons for such a version or transla-

translation of the words; 1. Because the subject person that is spoken of is but one, and that is the man Jesus Christ, and of him it is predicated and asserted, that he is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man, all is spoken of him; for if there were two divers subjects spoken of, *viz.* God the Father, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, as is generally conceived, and must be granted according to the ordinary translation of the words, then the Articles would not have been omitted, as those that understand the Greek Tongue understand very well. If God had been the subject spoken of, and if it had been asserted or predicated that he had been one, the words would have been, *εἰς γένη ὁ Θεός*; and if the word Mediator had been the subject, and that it had been predicated and asserted of him, that he had been one, the words wold then have been *εἰς γένη ὁ μεσίτης*, both of them would have been with the Article *εἰς*, but this Article is not prefixed to either of them, therefore neither of them are the subject spoken of, but rather they are things that are spoken of an other, which other is the man Jesus Christ, he is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man; and if it be otherwise then I have held forth, it is quite against the manner of the Greeks, and there will be hardly any place to be found that will parallel this, where there is such an Omission.

Now

Now, if it should be objected that there is no Article prefixed before the man Christ Jesus, which yet I say is the subject of whom these things are spoken, I answer that there needs not any Article there, because of the proper names Jesus Christ, before which the Article is usually pretermitted.

If we also consider the scope of the Apostle, it is more congruous thereto, the words being translated as I have presented; for his design is to prove, that now the Church of God was not to be kept within the narrow bounds & limits of Judea as heretofore, but to consist both of Jews and Gentiles, as the verse before shews, and many other, *God wil have all to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth:* But how doth the Apostle prove that? by this fifth ver. he proves it, for, saith he, the man Jesus Christ is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and men, if the words did run as they are translated, *For there is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and man;* there would be no such good consequence, for there was ever one God, and ever one Mediator betwixt God and men, and yet the Church did not extend beyond the bounds of Judea; therefore the Apostle speaks of God under a new consideration, which was not before, till the Apostles times, and that is of the man Jesus Christ, who is God blessed for ever more, and whose

whose work is to unite both Jews and Gentiles into one, as in *Gal. 3.28. Ephes. 2.11*, And when he calls this man Jesus Christ one God, it must be taken of *Deus unius*, God making one in a practicall way, as in *Zach. 14.9*. The Lord shall be King in all the earth, and in that day the Lord shall be one, and his Name one. This Lord is Christs, for of his Kingdome is this spoken, which shall be set up in all the earth, and in that day (*viz.* the day of his regnancy over all Nations, both Jews and Gentiles, for it is a prophecy of such a time) the Lord shall be one, and his Name one; it is not meant of the onenesse of essence, for the Lord was alwaies one in that sense, but of operation *effective*, he shall be one, he shall work alike, and in one manner in all Nations, and shall make them all one in him, they shall all serve him with one shoulder, with one consent. So in this of *Timothy*, God would have all to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the trath; for Jesus Christ is one God and one Mediator, that is, God uniting all in one, and reconciling all in one; The man Christ is God, and Mediator effecting this. This was foretold long before, but God is come in flesh now to accomplish it.

But if this exposition should not passe, it is easie to give another, for it is not denied, but that Christ Jesus was and is a man, nor is it denied

nied but that as Mediator he was a man, and it will be further confessed, that he could not have been Mediator unlesse he had been man; for therefore it was that he took not the nature of Angells, but the seed of *Abraham*, that he might be a meet Mediator to reconcile us to God. But the point in dispute is, Whether as Mediator he was not more then a man, or then a meer creature; and I have already shewed, that to mediate for God, and to God, required more sufficiency and ability then can be found in man or any creature.

The next Instance or Argument that I produced was this.

Instance 6. If Christ be but a meer creature, then the righteousnesse of Christ, which is imputed to believers, is not the righteousnesse of God, but the righteousnesse of a meer creature: but this is against the tenure of the Scripture, Phil.3.9.

To this he thus answers.

I suppose from some terms in your instance, and from the text you alledge, that by righteousnesse you mean that righteousnesse whereby believers stand in the sight of God free and cleare from all sin, in reference to the curse of the Law; thus he is the righteousnesse of God, through the faith of Jesus Christ, (that is, that in Jesus Christ which is the object of faith) unto all, and upon all them that believe, Rom.3.22. God is the principall Author, Christ

Christ the instrumentall Agent.

Rep. It is evident I can meane no other righteousnesse then that which he mentions, whereby believers stand cleare from all sin in reference to the stain and pollution of sin, as well as in reference to the curse of the Law.

Now what is it that he answers to this? He produceth a text out of *Rom.3.22.* by the mention of which he would divert the eyes of the Reader from the consideration of *Philip. 3.9.* (which was the Text that I produced for the confirmation of my Instance, or Argument) and would carry them to the consideration of another Text which speaks a truth, concerning which there is no controversie betwixt him and me: He tells me of a righteousness of God by the Faith of Jesus Christ, and of Gods being the principall Author of this righteousness, which I grant, though not in his sense, for he means it of the Father alone, but I understand it of Father, Son, and Spirit, this God is the efficient *a quo*, the efficient from whom righteousness is, for it is he that doth account persons that believe righteous, and doth acquit them from sin for the sake of Christ, *Rom.8.33.34. Ephes.4.32.*

But what is this to the purpose? is this any Answer to my Argument, or to the Scripture I produced? I speake of a righteousness imputed
to

to believers, which is the materiall cause of a believers justification, or of his righteousnesse in the sight of God ; and the imputation of this righteousnesse is the formall cause of Justification, and this righteousnesse that is imputed , is called the righteousnesse of God, *Philip.3.9.* but he tells me of a righteousnesse of God, which is from God as the Author or princ·pall Efficient, which is only true in this sense, as God is he that appointed, decreed and instituted the righteousnesse of Christ for the Justification of Beleevers, and doth also pronounce them just upon that account. But the Apostle *Philip.3.9.* doth not call the righteousnesse of Christ the righteousnesse of God in that sense, the words are these , *That I may be found in him, not having on mine own righteousnesse, which is of the Law, but that which is through Faith of Christ, the righteousnesse which is of God through Faith.* The Apostle in this place speaks of a righteousnesse which is by the Faith of Christ materially, as it is opposite to that righteousnesse which he calls his own righteousnesse; and the one, *viz.* his own righteousnesse, he calls the righteousnesse which is *ex Lege*, of the Law : now this must be understood materially,not efficiently; God did account persons just while the Covenant of works was afoot, in reference to righteousnesse, which materially

rially did consist in our obedience of the Law, the obedience of the Law was the matter of it, therefore it is called the righteousness which is of the Law. The other, *viz.* that righteousness which is through the Faith of Christ (that is, which is conveyed to us through Faith *viz.* Christ) he calls the righteousness which is of God, not efficiently but materially, for it is *ex Deo*, not *a Deo*, of God, not from God. God now accounts persons just (this Covenant of Grace being on foot) in reference to righteousness, not ours of the Law, but that of God, *viz.* that of the person who is God, the active and passive obedience of Christ who is God, which Faith in Christ possessest us of, and makes ours instead of that which was ours, *viz.* that of the Law; for the Apostle speaks of righteousness which he would not be found in, and of righteousness which he would be found in; the former is his own of the Law, the latter is of God by Faith; that is, of Christ, who is God, through faith in Christ. The Apostle speaks not here of an Act of Grace in God, that imputes the righteousness of another unto Believers, as theirs, and so accepts of it, but he speaks of that which is imputed, and is become a covering in which he would be found; and this he calls the righteousness, not of the Law, but of God, *viz.* the obedience of that person who is God-man, *viz.* Christ.

Suitable

Suitable to this is that which we read in 2 Cor. 5.21. *He made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* Here Christ is spoken of as a sinner, but it is in the abstract, to shew what a great sinner he was, and the causes hereof are mentioned; 1. God himself, *viz.* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, this God made Christ (considered as Mediator and surety of the Elect) a sinner, that is, he accounted him so: here is the Efficient *à quo*, from whom this was, this was God. 2. Here is the materiall cause, which is our sins put on him, and made his, for he had none of his own, it was for us. 3. Here is also the formall cause, which is in the imputation of our sins to him; it was for us that he was made, that is, by laying of our iniquities upon him instead of us, *Isay 53.6.* 4. Here is the finall cause that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, in which there is, 1. The efficient cause, that we might be made (that is) by God, accounted, reckoned by God. 2. There is the materiall cause, which is the righteousness of God, *viz.* of Christ, who is called in this place God, which is put on us, for we have no righteousness of our own, as Christ had no sinnes of his own. 3. There is the formall cause, which is Imputation; we are made, that is, by this righteousness of God put on us; therefore it is said, *through him;* that is, through the Imputation

tation of this righteousnesse of his, which is called the righteousnesse of God, or els through him, may be through faith in him.

He also makes Christ from this text of *Rom. 3. 22.* to be but an instrumentall Agent, in this righteousnesse of a believer; I suppose he draws it from these words [by the faith of Jesus Christ] for he will have this particle [*by*] to refer to the instrumentalnesse of the thing to which it doth belong: And if it were granted him in this, it would but make faith instrumentall, and not Christ; for it refers to faith, and not to Christ; It is not said, *By Jesus Christ*, but *by the faith of Jesus Christ*; and Christ is mentioned as the object of this faith, which the Apostle speaks of as the instrument. There is the righteousnesse of Christ, which is called the righteousnesse of God, which God looks upon, and hath respect to, and for the sake of which God accounts persons just and righteous: and this righteousnesse is therefore reputed the meritorious cause of our justification; and faith layes hold of this, and is the instrument to convey it to us, and to make it ours: So that this text serves not his purpose,

R

pose,

pose, nor doth it at all help him in that assertion of his, viz. of Christ's instrumentesse in agencie in reference to this righteousness. In the meane time he hath wholly passed over in silence the text that I alledged to prove my Argument by, without speaking one word in answer, according to the manner in which he hath dealt with me formerly.

But he undertakes to shew what that is in Christ which is imputed to us for righteousness.

It is (saith he) his obedience which was both active and passive: The opinion now adayes (saith he) is that the active obedience of Christ, whereby he did perfectly fulfil the Law, and his passive obedience, whereby he did perfectly suffer the curse of the Law, are imputed to us for righteousness. Now he could not (saith he) obey the Law as he was God, nor could he suffer the curse of the Law but as he was man; and so that righteousness of Christ which was imputed to us was a creature-righteousness.

Rep: It is granted that it is the obedience of

of Christ, both active and passive, that is imputed to us for righteousness: But why he expresseth himself in such language [*the opinion now-adayes is such*] as if it were but an opinion, and not the truth of God; as if it were others opinion, not his own opinion: as if it were now-adayes the opinion, not the opinion of former times; and as if onely he made use of it against me, and to promote his own assertion of a meer creature-righteousnesse imputed to us, and not that he did believe it (for so may any one judge that reads his expression) I cannot conceive why he should speak thus if he be sound in that point.

What ever his meaning may be in such words, yet sure I am his inference which he makes therefrom (notwithstanding the reason wherewith he seemeth to inforce it) is not right. *He could not obey the Law as God, he could not suffer the curse of the Law but as he was man, therefore his obedience which is imputed for righteousness, was as he was a creature.* There is a *non sequitur* in it, if it be put into the form of an Argument it will appear. If Christ could neither obey nor suffer but as a creature, then the obedience of Christ which is imputed for righteousness,

teousnesse, is the obedience of a meer creature, for in that sense he takes it : but the former is true, therefore the later. The consequence in the major Proposition is unsound, the reason is, because though obedience be imputed for righteousness, yet not simply and merely because it was obedience, and answered the Law, but because it was the obedience of such a person who was so great and glorious , as that he was not lesse then God , but very God , yet as God he performed it not , but as he was man;but the Godhead inabled the Manhood thereto, and did put the value, and worth, and rate, and price, upon that service of the Manhood.

Nor do I understand how Christ (if he had been a meer creature) could have performed a righteousness that could have been reckoned to another, in as much as it would have been all due , wholly due to God , as from himself being a creature, because of that absolute Sovereignty in God over every creature ; Nor doe I know how a meer creature-obedience can be imputed for righteousness to many millions of creatures, when yet any one of those creatures to whom it is imputed,

must

must have done as much, and must have suffered as much in reference to his own transgression, as that doing and suffering of Christ which is imputed to him amounts to, if Christ be but a mere creature.

And whereas he saith, *He could not have obeyed the Law as he was God*; I say, he could not (being but one) have obeyed the Law for so many, if he had not been God. He also saith, *He could not have suffered the curse of the Law but as he was man*. But I say and shall prove it (I hope) before I finish this work, that if he had been no more but man, he could not have suffered the curse of the Law for so many men.

The conclusion is this, that though a creature obeyed the Law, and a creature suffered the curse of it, yet the person that did both the one and other was not a meer creature, but more then a creature; therefore the righteoulnesse of this person was more then a meere creatures righteousness.

But he saith, He made haste to the seventh Instance; and it appeares he made

more haste then good speed , when he left the maine work behind him undone, when he did out-run the Scripture , wherein the strength of the Instance and Argument lay; yet as hasty as he is, though I take a little more leisure, I doubt not but to overtake him at last.

Instance 7. If Christ were a meer creature, then to pardon sinne belongs not to him , because the Scripture testifies that none can forgive sinnes but God, because all sinne is against God, therefore none can forgive it but God. But it is evident, that Christ took the Authority of forgiving sinne, Sonne, saith Christ , thy sinnes are forgiven thee , Luke 7. 48.

His Answer is, because many think that some weight lies in these words , I shall be a little the more large in my Answer to it.

Rep. No question but the Reader would conceive weight to be in the rest, because they were consonant to that Doctrine which hath been commonly received, and were looked upon as main points of Faith: But he thinks he hath more advantage against me in this instance, then in the rest, and that Scripture favours him more in the letter of the words, then it did in some of the

the rest, however it be; let it be consider'd what it is he saith to disable it.

He frames it into an Argument, but impaires the strength of it, though he said he would not marr it.

None can forgive sins but God:

But Christ did forgive sin, *Luke 7.48.*

Therefore Christ is God:

If he had done me right, the Argument should have run thus.

He that took the authority of forgiving sins, is not a meere creature, but is God.

But Christ took the authority of forgiving sin:

Therefore Christ is God.

Had the Argument been thus formed, his answer to the major might have been spared, and so might my Reply: but now I must follow him as he hath framed it.

He replies to the Major, viz. *none can forgive sins but God.*

1. By objecting against the Witnesse, which he supposeth I bring from *Mar. 2.7.* which he saith is no part of the Standard; for (saith he) the dark Scribes, who were enemies to Christ, did speak it.

Rep. If I had quoted *Mar. 2.7.* he might have had some advantage against me, but

seeing I did not, he might well have born me: Might not I collect it from the Testimony of the Scripture in very many places, where it is attributed to God by *Moses*, and the Prophets; yea where God himself doth assume it to himself, as his own Royall priviledge, *Exod.* 34. 7. *Psal.* 32. 2. *Esay* 43. 25. and *Chap.* 55. 7. *Jer.* 31. 34. yea certainly, when I used those words which the Scripture testifies; I minded such like Scriptures as these, yet I will not deny, but that the saying of the Scribes and Pharises was in my mind; and if I had quoted the place where they assert it, as the Prerogative of God to forgive sinnes, I need not be ashamed, because as dark as they were in other things, they are clear enough in this, and asserted nothing but what the Scripture clearly held out, as I have shewed.

2. By objecting against the Doctrine which he saith I teach; for (saith he) that none can forgive sinnes in any sense but God only, may passe for an error, for it is the duty of all men to forgive sinnes, which others commit against them, *Mat.* 6. 14. And it is the priviledge of some men to forgive all sins, in reference to the curse of the Law, *John* 20. 23.

Rep.

Rep. He conceives me to be a very Novice in the knowledge of the Scripture, else he would not have presented such poor objections, or he hath a mind to cavill at expressions, and to contradict if all be not punctually expressed, though it be never so easie to be understood. Doth he think me to be so simple & ignorant of the truth, as that I should understand that position, None can forgive sinnes but God, in the greatest latitude, so as to exclude that act of love, and charity, and mercy, and compassion, which is due from one man to another, in reference to such personall trespasses and offences which are committed mutually by men that converse with one another, or to exclude ministeriall Acts of remission of sinnes, which some men (which have received an office from Christ, and in such office Authority and Commission from him to remit sinnes) have power to passe? I shoule in so doing have robbed poor saint, weak, and feeble Christians of a great part of that solace and comfort which Christ hath left them here upon earth: He might therefore have known, that I understood the Proposition in a limited sense; None hath power in himself to forgive sinne but God, none in his

his own Name can do it, but God : yea, did I not expresse my meaning in the words following? *It is evident that Christ took Authority of forgiving sin.* I do not say, that Christ had Authority derived to him, but he took it as that which did properly belong to him: he might therefore have suffered the major Proposition to have passed, and have fallen upon the minor, which at last he doth;

His words are these.

Now for your Minor, that Christ did forgive sin. 'Tis true, saith he, that Christ did forgive sin, and that he the Son of Man had on earth power to do it, as he himself speaks, *Mark.2.10.* But what will this help to bring in the conclusion that Christ is God? Doubtless no, because meer creatures (as above) in some sense have power to forgive sinne: if it can be proved that Christ is principall in forgiving, somewhat may be done.

Rep. If it can be proved that Christ is principall in forgiving, is only something done? is not the whole done? I suppose there needs no more to be done: I shall therefore attempt the proof of that from the very Scripture he conceipts I alluded to, which he mentions, which is *Mar.2.10.* 1. It is evident from the contest betwixt Christ

Christ and the Scribes, they did not charge Christ (no not in their hearts) with blasphemy, as conceiving that Christ did not forgive sins ministerially, by the authority which he derived from another, for in that sense they would not have said, *Who can forgive sins but God?* They would not have made it proper to God to forgive sins, for they knew that the Priests ministerially did forgive the sins of the people, that brought their sacrifices, and the Prophets also in the name of God did it, as *Nathan* did *David*: nay in this sense they could not attribute it to God at all; for God cannot be the Minister of any, to pardon sin in another's name; therefore they looked upon Christ as forgiving sin in his own name, and by his own proper power, and therefore (conceiving him onely to be a man) they accused him of blasphemy. Now if Christ had been onley a man, and had forgiven sin ministerially, in the name, and by the authority of the Father, and not in his own name, nor by his own power, why doth he not declare so much to them, and tell them that the thing was even so as they apprehended, that no man, nor creature hath hath any absolute independent power in himself to forgive sins, but it is the royall pre-

prerogative of God, as they conceived, but their error lay in this, they were mistaken in him, they conceived of him that he forgave sins in his own name, and by his own proper power; and he did it not, but it was done by a derived power, and in a ministeriall way; why was not his way of doing it cleared up to the Scribes by him? when he knew they were right in their thoughts of the thing, onely mistook his acting, conceiving that he acted what he did not act. But it is apparent that Christ doth contest with them upon another point, and undertook to prove that he the Son of man (though they looked upon him as a meer man, and nothing more) was yet such an one, that without blasphemie he might take upon himself, as a thing suitable to him, and very proper to forgive sins in that very sense, as they called blasphemie, that is, in his own name, and by his own power, and authority, without any dependence upon any other, to whom it more properly belonged, as they conceived, in which contest with them he asserted himself to be the God to whom it belongs to pardon sin: Therefore Christ charged them with evill thoughts of him, as it is expressed by *Matthew* in his relating of

of the story, *Math. 9.4.* not because they imagined that he exercised that power which he did not, *viz.* an absolute independent power from himself, when as he onely exercised a delegated power which was derived to him: this was not the cause why Christ challenged them for thinking evill in their hearts, but because they denied him to have that power which he had, and said he blasphemed because he assumed it, and did so appropriate it to God, whom they conceived a spirit in heaven, that they denied it to him in flesh, as he was the Son of man upon earth in a state of exinanition,emptied of his glory. Therefore in *Mat.9.6.* and so in *Mar.2.10.* there is a concurrence of the Evangelists, that Christ to convince them of their error, in restraining and straightning him in his power, which they would grant to God, but not to him, speaks these words; *But that you may know that the Son of man on earth, hath power to forgive sins; I say unto thee, arise, &c.* If that had not been the Scribes and Pharisees errors, that they granted that to God, which they denied to him, he should rather have used other words then those words that he did; and have said rather, *that you may know, I do not assume*

assume that power which you think I do assume; for such words as these would have suited the Tenent of my Antagonist better, and the error of the Scribes, had that been their error: But Christ contests with them about power, and will make them know that he had a power which they would not grant him, but called it blasphemie, even the very power of God, though he be also the Son of man on earth. And therefore he useth these words, *That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth.* This contest of Christ with the Scribes puts it out of doubt that Christ challenged to be principall and equal with the Father in pardoning sin, and would not own himself to be ministeriall or instrumentall therein.

2. It appears by this, that Christ is principall in forgiving, because the Scribes, and Pharisees, had no sooner conceived thoughts of a difference betwixt God and him, denying him to be God, and charging him with blasphemie for assuming that power which was peculiar to God: but while such imaginations were in their hearts, Christ(before they could or did utter them) did discover them, and reprove them:

them : and therein Christ gave a signe to them, that they had evill thoughts of him while they looked upon him as lesse then God, or as below God; for they might confute themselves in their own false conceits of Christ. After this manner do we charge this person with blasphemie, because he forgives sins being but a man, and not God, as we have thought, and yet he knows the thoughts of our hearts, and discovers that which we had only conceived, and had not uttered, and who can do such a thing as this, but God? Whether is it easier to say thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, wherefore think you evill in your hearts? when we expressed nothing with our lips. Is it not as great a work to know the heart, as to forgive sins? Doth not Solomon speak to God after this manner, *Thou onely knowest the hearts of the children of men,* 2 Chron. 6. 30. Certainly, this person (though in flesh) is notwithstanding more then flesh, none other but God. Christ administered matter of such expostulation to them, that they might correct their former erring thoughts. But if they were not instructed thereby, yet we should understand what thence may be collected. The same person forgave sins as discerned hearts : but Christ
not

not as man, but as God, discerned hearts; therefore not as man, but as God he forgave sins. Nor can it be said that Christ knew their thoughts, because God revealed them to him, or because they gave some signes what imaginations were in them; for *Mark* declares that Christ knew what they thought in and from his own Spirit, that is, by himself, and not from any other; therefore he forgave sins by and from himself, and not by or from any other, *Mark* 2.8.

3. It is manifest from the Miracle that Christ wrought, that Christ was principall in forgiving, and that by and from himself he did it, and not by power derived to him; for he wrought the Miracle authoritatively, and by his own power, he did not work it in his Fathers name, that is, by way of dependence upon him, and by prayer to his Father, as sometimes he did when he would shew his manhood, that he was the Son of man, as wel as the Son of God, but he wrought it by command, speaking in his own name, *I say unto thee arise, take up thy bed and walk;* and this authoritative command came forth of his mouth, was effectual before their eyes, for this end, that he might confute those evil thoughts they had.

had conceived and harbour'd in their hearts concerning him, *viz.* that he had blasphemed ; because being but a man , he had arrogated and assumed that power to himself, which is proper to God. Had this been the Scribes and Pharisees error, that they thought he took to himself that power which indeed he did not, *viz.* an absolute and independent power in remitting sins, and yet it was but a derived power which he had from another, and that it was not his own which he exercised then in the working of this miracle, that they might know that they erred in their conceptions concerning his manner of working ; he should at this time especially, rather then at another time, by invocation upon his Father have effected it. And the reason is, because Christ's designe was in working this miracle, to teach them somewhat which they understood not , and to rectifie their apprehensions concerning himself, as these words import, *That ye may know that the Sonne of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.* *I say unto thee who art sick, &c. arise and walk.* Now what was it that he would teach them ? was this it, that he did act dependently upon his Father, and had no such power of his own to forgive sins , but derived it from his Father ? If so, was this the means or the way to convince them of it, to command in his own name the impotent man that was sick of so deadly a disease, to arise and walk , without any looking up to

heaven, or groaning in his spirit, or speaking unto God his Father to effect it in him or by him? Was it not rather the way to confirme them in their errore (if that were their errore) then to bring them to the knowldg of the truth? therefore it is manifest and clear that he would teach them some other thing wherein indeed they erred, and stood in need to be rectified; they thought him but a man, and that he usurped that power which belonged not unto him, but was proper to God, and that was to forgive sinnes in his own name, and not ministerially, but by and from himself; this they called blasphemy. Now he would in this rectifie their erring judgements, by working a miracle in his own name, and by a commanding word, accompanied with answerable power; and therefore saith, *That you may know that the Son of man, even he himself hath power in himself, and not derived from any other; to forgive sins* I say, even I speak it as one that have authority in my self, and need not to seek out to any other, I say, *arise and walk.* This absolute and independent way and manner of working this miracle, is a good demonstration in what way, and after what manner he forgave sins; and both by the one and by the other, he would convince the Scribes and Pharisees, that he (though clothed in flesh, and appearing only as a man) was yet God; equall with his Father, and could work the same works of his Father.

Now,

Now, though Christ seems to speak of the act of forgiving sins as an easier work then if he should say to the sick man, *arise and walk*, as these words of his seem to import, *Whether is it easier, &c.* yet the works are both alike, though one not easier then the other; nor did Christ look upon the one as easier then the other, nor did the Scribes and Pharisees look upon one as easier then the other; for they look upon the act of absolving from sinne as proper to God, and not appertaining to man; But withall they thought that he deluded the people when he spake the words, *thy sins are forgiven thee*, because the effect was inward, and not to be discerned by the eyes of the body, and so the people could not discover the fraud and falsehood in working; therefore they imagined it was farre easier for Christ to say *thy sinnes are forgiven thee*, in which he could not be detected, if the effect followed not, then for him to say, *arise and walk*, which if he had not had a power answerable to that word of command, would discover his impostures, and expose him to shame and reproach; in this sense it was easier for one that would delude, to say *thy sinnes are forgiven thee*, then to say *arise and walk*; but Christ would shew that the one was as truly wrought and done as the other, and both of them done by the power of his Godhead.

There are also other Scriptures which may give light, that Christ in forgiving sins was prin-

cipall, and not receiving power from another :
 1. Christ gave power to his Disciples, *John* 20.23. (the place which he quoted) to remit sins, effectually, so & as that they should be remitted and to retaine sins effectually, and so as that they should be retained. Now this power of delegating power to others, doth shew a power residing in Christ himself, and doth shew that Christ is the principall Lord against whom sins are committed, because he both conveys a power to the Apostles, and doth ratifie the exercise of it.
 2. The Apostle forgave sins in the person of Christ in *2 Cor* 2.10. that is, he did it instrumentally and representatively, and in the name of another who was chief in it, and that was Christ. It is not laid in the person of God, as it should have been said, if Christ had not been God, and principall in that power of forgiving.

But he saith, *It cannot be, because the Scripture cannot oppose it self.* And he presents what Scripture. Tels us, *The Scripture (saith he)tels us that we are justified by the man Jesus Christ, Acts 13 38, 39. be it known unto you men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgivenesse of sinnes, and by him all that do believe are justified, &c.*

Reply. The Scripture tels us, that through the man Christ we are justified, but the Scripture tels us not that we are justified by Christ as man ; It is a granted thing by us all, that the person that justifies

justifies us is man (for we say he is both God and Man) But that he justifies as man, or remits sinnes as man, is denied by us, and the contrary hath already been proved; I have shewed before that the Sonne of man is said to be heaven, which was impossible, because he was on earth when he spake these words; the words are therefore thus to be understood, the person, that is, the Sonne of man, being also God, was in heaven at that rime, but not as the Sonne of man, but as God, so in this place it is to be understood.

There is some difference to be made in Christ's justifying of us. If we speak of the meritorious cause of Justification, whole Christ, and the whole of Christ doth concurre in it, contribute to it, and effect it for God (looking upon that which was done and suffered, and upon the person, (viz. the excellency and glory of the person) that did it, and suffered it; in which, both the Godhead and the manhood acted the one by obeying, the other by enabling and presenting as his (as indeed it was) (the union betwixt the two natures considered) pronounced beleevers just upon that account. Not that the manhood of Christ merited, but the whole of Christ acted in those things wher. in the merit was. But if we speak of the efficient cause of justification, or of pardon of sinne, Christ considered in his divine nature as God only is agent in it, because he alone against whom sinne is committed, can from and by him-

self acquit and discharge therefrom; and so Christ as God can only do it, and he did it as God, as I have proved from *Mark* 22. 10.

I conceive that in this Text Christ is not spoken of as the efficient, from whom justification and pardon of sins comes, but as Mediator through whom, or as the means and merit by whom forgivenesse of sinnes comes; in which sense it is said that Christ was the Lamb of God which took away the sinnes of the world. My reason is, because it is said, *through this man is preached forgivenesse, and by him all that beleeve are justified*, not efficiently, but mediatoriously and meritoriously. It is not said he pardoned sin, but through him pardon was preached; nor is it said he justified, but through him are justified those that beleeve; that is, through him as the meanes; and herein the manhood is not to be excluded from acting in those works which God accounts for a beleevers righteousness, and in reference to which God justifies; but principally, yea solely to be acknowledged, but so farre as concernes the respect that God gives to such actions, and the acceptance that they find with God, which is this, *viz.* God imputes them unto beleevers as their righteousness, and for the sake of them doth pardon their sins; the manhood is not at all herein to be mentioned. But nothing that can be answered to this can reach the instance, because this text was impertinent, and I might

might have passed it by, without giving any answer to it, because Christs pardoning of sinne in way of efficiency, is that which the Instance or Argument which I produced, intends and proves, and this Scripture disables it not, because it speaks of another thing, and not of that.

But he goes on, and tells us what Scripture saith farther, viz. That Christ prayed to another (on the Jewes behalf) for the forgivenesse of sinne, Luke 23. 34. Then said Jesus, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do. Therefore Christ is not the principall forgiver of sins, according to Scripture.

Reply. Christ prayed to another, viz. the Father, for the forgivenesse of sin, and another prayed to him for the pardon of sin, viz. Stephen, and the Jewes were the subjects that were prayed for in both; What must then be said to this? and what answer is to be given to it? Alas it is not difficult to speak to it. The Scripture hath clearly untyed the knot; If Christ were not a man, he could not pray to another; and if he were nothing more then a man, another could not pray to him; and the Scripture declares both, while it shewes him to be God and man. As man therefore he humbles himself, he prayes unto him that was God. It was a time of Humiliation to Christ, and this was an action of humiliation in Christ, but as God he was prayed to by him that was a man, and with adoration also,

though he was in heaven in reference to his manhood, he veiled his Godhead when he prayed to God ; Stephen unveiled it, when he prayed to him. So that there is no good consequence in this, that because both the Scripture and himself do declare him to be man in his praying for the pardon of sins, therefore Scripture and himself have denied him to be God in his pardoning of mens sins.

His third Scripture is *Act 5. 30, 31.* *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree, him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance unto Israel, and forgiveness of sins;* Hence he collects that Christ received from another his power of forgiving sins.

Rep. This Scripture seems to favour his opinion more then any that he hath alledged, and it hath the most seeming strength in it for his purpose. But this answer may be returned unto it. Christ doth fall under a double consideration in Scripture, he may be looked upon absolutely as the Son of God, and second person in the Trinity, as *Jehovah*, and as *o θεος* very God ; or he may be looked upon relatively, as *Θεονθπωτης*, God man, as *Immanuel*, God with us, or in our nature, as God manifest in the flesh, and as sent into the world, and executing the office of Mediator. If he be considered in the former acceptation, he is essentially Lord ; and that one Lawgiver in all the creatures are the works of his giver

hands, and subject to him, and every transgression and sinne that is committed, is against him; and it belongs to him with the Father and the holy Ghost (who are one God with himself) to pardon sinne, to acquit from the guilt, and to deliver from the curse thereof, because he can turn away his wrath, and hath power over all plagues, and can save from them, and so he receives no power to forgive sins, but it belongs to him and cannot be separated from his Godhead, but is naturally, essentially and eternally his. But if he be considered in the latter acceptio[n], then many things are derived to him, as the office of Mediatorship, and a Lordship, and the name Saviour is given him upon that account, which is a name above every name of the Creatures, and Prince and Captaine of our salvation, is a name put upon him, and belonging to him; in this sense it is given to him to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins. Now it must be understood as I have expressed in my former Treatise, that the giving of these things doth not deny any intrinscall or inward perfection which Christ hath, but rather supposeth it; and it must be granted, that Christ, to whom these things are given, according to his due nature, hath all his perfection without the gift of these, and that these are but declarative, and serve to manifest that essentia[l] riches and glory which he had with the Father from eternity, and that his naturall Dominion

nion and Lordship (which cannot be separated from his Deity) is that which founds such donations and gifts which are too high for any creature, and would carry away Divine glory from him, who is God, if they should be given to any meere creature, and they are to be exercised by the help of the Godhead of Christ, else they could not be acted by him, as being too great for any man or meere creature. Indeed the humanity hath fellowship with the Godhead in the glory of the having and executing these things; and to the manhood it is glory derived, which was not before, but to the Deity of Christ it is glory manifested and declared only.

More particularly, It is given to Christ as Mediator to dispense pardon of sin, and it belongeth to his Priest-hood to do it. The Priests of the Law they did it, externally and ministerially, figuratively and typically; they pronounced clean and unclean, so farre as concerned the flesh; but Christ did it, and doth it effectually, and spiritually, pronouncing and discharging the conscience from all sinne; and what was the reason of this difference? They did it as men, therefore in weakness, and could speak, but were not able to effect what they spake; but Christ did it as the Sonne of God, yea as the eternall Son of God, as the Apostle testifies, *Heb. 7. 3.* So that the very Priest-hood of Christ, that it might be effectuall in the works of it { and this of pardoning of

of sin, was one of them) was founded in the eternall Son-ship of Christ, and therein lay this ability and power to performe the works of it, and principally this work of remitting sinnes: So that though the way of dispensing pardon be given to Christ, yet the power of dispensing was not given, but is as ancient as his Son-ship; therefore he erres in his inference which he fetcheth from this Text of *Acts* 5. 31. When he saith, *that he received from another his power of forgiving sins*: For it was not power that he received, but the way of exercising of it. It is acted in the flesh as Mediator, even since Christ came in the flesh, and now the Son of man, forgives sinnes, that is, the person that is man and the son of man forgives, but not as he is man or the son of man, but as he is God and the Son of God. For though it may be said that the Mediator pardoneth sin efficiently, as well as Meritoriously, as Priest; yet it cannot be said that the whole of the Mediator doth it, but the divine nature alone acts in it. It may be said of a man who consists of soul and body, that he meditateth, but it cannot be said of the whole of man that he meditateth, but of the minde only. It may also be said of him that he walketh; but it is to be understood of his body only, and not of his minde, yet because of the union betwixt body and soul (both of them making but one man) what either doth is attributed to the whole

whole. So it is with Christ our Mediator, he bore our sinnes as man only, for the God-head could not suffer, he purged away our sinnes as God-man: for the man-hood acted, and the God-head merited, he pardoned sin as God only, because he is supream Lord only as he is God: yet the Mediator doth all these, that is, he that is both God and man doth them; but in this different way he doth them. And so it appears that still he is the principall in this work of forgiving sins, because he doth it as God, and that this gift (which respects not the power it self of dispensing, but the way only of dispensing doth adde nothing to the intrinsecall perfection of Christ, but is manifestive of that inward essentiall glory, which he had with the Father before any beginning was, which was vailed by Christ's assuming flesh, and yet manifested in flesh, by acts which were too high for flesh, of which nature this of pardoning sin was one.

The conclusion is this, the work of forgiving sin is high and glorious, proper and peculiar, and suitable to this great and most high God, Jesus Christ; the Mediatorly the way of dispensing it is below this excellent person Christ, who is not only the son of the highest, but the highest, and it was the humbling and debasing and emptying of himself to act such a work in such a way.

The 8th Argument or Instance (as he calls it) is this. If

If Christ be a meer creature , then the value of that offering which Christ offered , when he offered himself to God , is taken away , and the satisfaction which Christ gave to divine justice , is destroyed ; for if the person that dyed were a meer man , and the blood that was shed was the blood of a meer man , and not of God as it is called , Acts 20. 28. then how could it satisfie for the sins of many transgessours ? For there is no proportion betwixt one meer man dying for sin , and many men sinning and deserving death each of them for the sins they have committed . And how an finite justice offended should be satisfied with a sacrifice infinite in value , is unconceiveable , and against the tenor of the Scripture .

He puts it into this forme .

That doctrine which takes away the value of Christs offering , and destroys the satisfaction which he gave to divine justice , brings in as it were another Gospel , &c.

But that doctrine which makes Christ a meer creature , doth so , therefore

He grants the Major , and answeres to the proofs of the Minor proposition , which are presented in the forme of two Queries , the first was ,

If Christ was a meer creature , then how could he satisfie for the sins of many transgessours ?

To this he makes this reply .

If it please you to consider , Rom. 5. 12. and so for .

forward, you may answer your own Querie; or see a good reason of this which I shall now propound.

If Adam were a meer creature, how could his sin make many transgressours? If through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace by one man Jesus Christ hath abounded unto many. Rom. 5. 15. Christ as well as Adam was a common person, and therefore the Lord having laid on him the iniquity of us all, and he bearing the curse of the Law, his members are delivered both from the sinne and curse.

Reply, There is nothing in the place which he hath directed me to, viz. Rom. 5. 15. which he hath or can fetch out with all his consideration that will answer my Querie. His asking of an other question will be no answer to mine. Adams sinne might make many transgressours, upon that account, as no mans righteousness can render them (being transgressours) righteous and just persons.

1. All persons which afterward sprung from him, were in his loyns at that time when he sinned, and were parts of him, and consequently they sinned in him, and with him, his sinne was their sinne, it extended unto them, and they could not but participate of it, as of Levi it is said, that he paid tythes in Abrahams loynes, Heb. 7. 9, 10.

2. Adams state in which he stood, when the whole

whole world was in him, was a state of grace and favour with God , from which (if he sinned) himself was to fall and all his posterity with him; after the manner of some persons that holds an estate, upon the good will of their Lord, whom if they offend they are cast out and all their posterity with them , for that is the condition upon which it is given to be possessed , and the children and off-spring are in volved in the guilt of such persons trespasses , whose favour is on such termes ; God is to be looked upon as soveraigne Lord of all creatures , to whom it belongs to shew favour to what creatures he will , and upon what termes he will , and under what conditions he pleaseth , and under what penalties (in case of transgression) liketh him; therefore it was that he set *Adam* over the works of his hands , entred into a conditionall League and Covenant with him , and did both priviledge him , and restrain him , and abridge him therein; and this was done under penalty of dying , both to him and his , in case of trespass , *thou shalt dye the death* (saith God) to him . And thus it came , that through the offence of one , many are dead.

3. Sinne was propagated and generated to and in *Adams* posterity , after that *Adam* fell , and lost Gods image . It is said of him that begat a son after his own image , *Gen. 5. 3.* And so all persons came to be conceived in iniquity , and to be

be borne in sin, for out of an unclean thing nothing that is clean can proceed. And so it comes to passe, that *Adams* sinne made many transgref-sours; for by propagation all men have sins of their own (over and above the sinne of *Adam*,) imputed to them. Thus the passage of sin and death, from one *Adam* to all men, appears facile and easie; there is no obstruction in the way, so veraignty and holinesse and justice, and truth furthered it, effected it.

But now in reference to Christ it cannot be thus asserted, that righteousness passeth upon men after this manner. 1. Righteousnesse is not propagated at all, but only imputed. 2. It is not by participation, because none are in Christes loynes by nature: Christ hath no naturall seed, that are parts of him. 3. If there be any such relation betwixt Christ and men, as that Christ should be a father to them, and they children to him, that he should be as a second *Adam*, it is not unto all, but to those only that beleeve and this is also meeirely through grace, and so there may be an imputation of righteousness from one to many, but it is through grace. Therefore it is said, the grace of God hath abounded by one man unto many: Not unto all men, but to all that receive it, that do beleeve, vers. 17. 4. Being to be imputed through grace, there comes to be an obstruction to it; justice and truth must be satisfied, before there be any place for grace;

and

and if grace cannot passe, the gift of grace which is righteousnesse and life to men through Christ, cannot passe neither. And so it appears that the way of sins passing is more ready from one man to many, then the way of righteousnesse abounding through one to many. Because of satisfaction that must interpose, that grace may have a free and open passage unto many. 5, If it be through satisfaction, that must interpose, before the grace of God, and the gift by grace can by one abound to many; and if first the sins of those many, that grace abounds to, through one, must be laid upon that one, that that one might bear the curse of the Law, that by this means the grace of deliverance (which consists in righteousnesse imputed, and in life,) might passe over, through that one, and abound to those many, (as he himself (though somewhat darkely) doth confess) then this one man (through whom grace must abound to many) cannot be any one, but such an one who is able to give satisfaction for many. And concerning this satisfaction the querie is made, how it could be that any one meer man could satisfie for the sinnes of many transgreſſours; and the disproportion is pleaded: *No proportion betwixt one meer man dying for sin, and many men sinning and deserving death, each of them for the sins they have committed.* But he makes no answer at all unto it, but sends me to Rom. 5. 15. to answer my self, which

slight proceedings will satisfie none but such who are willing to be deluded by him.

The question only will be , what satisfaction is necessary , that grace may abound to many ? Because there be many that conceive that any satisfaction will serve (to make man capable of grace) which God will accept , and they do not look at proportion. And there are others that hold that no satisfaction at all is necessary, in respect of God, because God having loved the Elect, loves them for ever, and there is no change at all in Gods love, nor is God capable of changing , but is immutable in his nature ; and therefore though man sinned , yet his love was not broken off thereby ; nor was there any breach on his part at all, nor did Christ dye to satisfie him at all ; for he was satisfied always in his own love, which continued the same after man had sinned as before ; for in his love he gave Christ after man had transgressed; therefore the breach was on mans part ; he had wronged God, and merited nothing but hatred, and wrath, and all evill, and no love at all ; and having an evil and guilty conscience, he was suspiciois of God, and expected no good from him , but feared all evil, and could not conceive how God could love such a creature , or shew any grace or favour to him, that had sinned in such sort against him ; and knew not how God could do it without satisfaction ; Thus unsatisfied was mans conscience

(having

(having sinned) concerning the finding of any mercy from Gods hands; therefore God gave Christ and delivered him up to death, and layed him under the curse of the Law, not to satisfie himself thereby, but to satisfie mans conscience, and to give rest and quiet to it, and that God cared not for a few drops of bloud, but there was a wound in the conscience of those that had sinned, that would not be healed but by such a manifestation of the Fathers love, as in giving Christ, and delivering him up for such, appeared. And some say Christ came to reveal the Fathers councells, and dyed for the confirmation of them. This opinion takes hold of many, and spreads and prevailes much; my designe is not to make a large discourse in way of answer, because it is beside my present undertaking; only because I am necessitated (in reply to him) to insist a little on the point of satisfaction, and because the point is of great concernment, I shall not over sleightly passe over it, but stay a while in answer to both the foremention'd Tenents, and shall first shew that some satisfaction to God is necessary, and then declare what it is.

Sol. And first I shall premise some things, and afterward lay down some positions.

That which is to be premised, is: 1. That there are no passions and affections in God, after the manner of men; there is neither love nor hatred, nor wrath, nor anger, nor joy, nor

grieſ, nor any ſuch by which the mindes and ſpiri-
 tis of men are moved and diſturbed; for God
 had all things before him at firſt that ſhould come
 to paſſe afterward; and if it were good, it was
 of his own operation; and if it were evill, it was
 of his own permission and ordering alſo, and
 that which he could eaſily have prevented. So
 that it is irrationall to conceive that God ſhould
 be ſtirred or moved with any thing that comes to
 paſſe, or that he ſhould be in divers tempers or
 mindes, or that he ſhould be one thing to day, and
 an other thing to morrow; this is inconsistent
 to that abſolute bleſſedneſſe of God; therefore
 though theſe things are ſpoken of God in Scri-
 pture, yet they be *humanitas dicta*, they be at-
 tributed to God after the manner of men. And
 theſe things that are paſſions and affections in
 men, are attributes and decrees, and counſels, and
 actions and operations in God; and imply not the
 leaſt mutation or change in God. As for exa-
 ple, Gods loving of *Jacob* before he had done
 good to deſerve ſuch a thing, what was it but
 Gods goodneſſe and graciouneſſe; which is an
 attribute in God, noted in decreeing *Jacob* to
 glory, which is called Elecſion; and Gods ha-
 det to *Eſau* before he had done evill, what
 was it but his ſovereignty and abſolute domi-
 on which God hath over the creatures, without
 being capable to give any account, exerciſed it
 appointing him to perdition and deſtruction

they are not passions and affections in God, but they are acts of the unchangeable will of God, in which the above mentioned properties in God are expressed. And Gods wrath and anger is not a passion in God, but it is an act of Gods righteousness and justice, by which he repells that which is evill in the creature, and contrary to his own holinesse, in testification of the unsuitableness of it to him, and of that which he justly expects from the creature.

2. There is difference to be put betwixt the decree and purpose of God, concerning life and glory, in reference to such persons whom he will glorifie goodness towards, and the way and means by which God will effect it and accomplish it, which is in advancing holiness and righteousness; in order to which he made the first *Adam* after his image, gave him an holy and righteous nature, writte his will in his heart, and then entred into a Covenant of life and peace, and glory with him upon the observation of his will; and threatened death, and all evil, and misery, upon the violation thereof; and this Covenant was in reference to himself, and his posterity that were in his loyns. This latter is called in Scripture the way of peace and life, *Rom. 3. 16, 17.* The former is hid in God; for who hath been of his counsell, or who knoweth further then he reveleth? and it hath its being in God, and nowhere else. The latter is declared to the creature

and it is the creatures capacity of life , or the
visible state of life into which God did put him,
and it hath its being in the creature.

3. There is difference to be put betwixt the
love of God to the creature , and the amity of
God with the creature; or betwixt the decree of
grace in electing the creature to life and glory , &
the prosecution of the decree in suitable and pro-
portionable actings of God toward the creature.

If there be a right distinguishing betwixt these
things that thus differ , these following proposi-
tions and conclusions will be better understood
and more easily granted.

1. When sin was committed against God, the
love of God was not broken off, nor the coun-
cell, purpose and thoughts of God, concerning
glorifying of such persons whom he had chosen to
life and glory , were not altered , nor changed;
for this foundation stands sure , the Lord know-
eth who are his , nor is God in this sence like
man that he should repent : Those whom he
thus loveth , he loveth to the end , that is, he
cannot cast off whom he hath chosen. For these
councils of grace concerning these persons be-
ing without respect either to good or evill in the
persons themselves, *Rom. 9. 11.* The good or
evill that followed them in such persons , could
neither confirme them nor overturne them ; be-
cause they stand upon this basis, the immutable
and unchangable Will of God, not upon the
un-

uncertain and wavering creature; and hence it came to passe, that when one means of effecting them, *viz.* mans own righteousnesse proved ineffectual, God (to shew his firmenesse in his Counells) found out other means to accomplish them by, *viz.* the righteousness of another, and therefore gave Christ, *John* 3. 16.

2. Though sinne did not, could not overturn the Decree of life, yet it broke the Covenant of life, and so overthrew that visible state of life in which the elect were, whom God had chosen; and so brought them into a dreadfull visible state of death, though not into a final miserable state, because of Gods election. Sin altered the state of elect persons, though it altered not Gods thoughts concerning them; so that it might be said, he that was before in the state of salvatiō, is now through sin in the state of condemnation; though it cannot be said that God will (because of sin) now damn that person, whom his thought and purpose was to have saved, *Rom.* 3. 11. *Destruction and misery is in their paths;* and ver. 23. *All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God* and *Rom.* 5. 12. *As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed over all men, because all had sinned.*

3. Sin having overthrown the Covenant of life and glory, and brought men into the state of death, all hope and expectation of life was (together with it) taken away, and nothing but a fearfull expectation of death and condemnation.

It is said of *Adam* when he had sinned, that he hid himself from God, when God came into the Garden, as one that expected no good from Cod. We read of the condition of the elect, before deliverance, that *through fear of death they were all their life subject to bondage.* This is to be interpreted in reference to their consciences, which tormented them with the representations of death ; but this will be granted, that Christ came to satisfie the conscience and quiet it, but not to satisfie God.

4. Though the election of God stand sure, and the love of God could not be broken off, yet the amity and friendship of God was brought to an end, and wrath was manifested instead of love, and God instead of prosecuting his Decree of life, prosecutes the breach of the Covenant of life, which was violated by sin ; and ratifies the threatening, which was this, *thou shalt surely die;* and doth unfold the curse in it, and open it in some part of its latitude, which was shut up under these generall words, *thou shalt die,* Gen. 3. 16. to 20. And *Ephes.* 2. 3. Elect person are called *Children of wrath,* as well as the reprobate; they are in one state till deliverance come. And *1 Thes.* 1. 10. Jesus is said to deliver us from wrath to come. Now wrath is not a passion in God, as I have shewed, but it is Gods righeteoufulness conflicting with, and prosecuting sinne, *viz.* the first sin, in the violation of the Covenant of

life, and all after sins also ; And such which sinne, are accursed, *Gal. 3. 10.* that being the sentence of the Law, is the sentence of God, whose the Law is, so that God as a Judge prosecuting sinne on the Lawes behalfe, is represented unto us.

5. If God must be a righteous and just God, and faithfull and true God, he must be (even he himself) the prosecutor of the Elect, notwithstanding his Decree of life and glory, in which he had comprehended them, wherein his goodnes freely wrought from all eternity towards them; because God had threatned, and must not reverse it, least he suffer in his truth, least his word be falsified, which was, that *Adam* transgres sing his Commandement should surely die; and the law saith, *That that soule that sins shall die;* His truth therefore binds him to it; God must be true and every man a liar, that contradicts him in that which he speaks. And the Apostle *Paul* speaks of some persons, *That knew the judgement of God, that they that commit such things are worthy of death;* He had mentioned many sins which men committed, and brings in the knowledge that they had of the demerit of such sins against them, that such sins were worthy of death; and that it might not be thought that they judged these sins worthy of death, through the working of their consciences only, the Apostle shews that they had the know ledge of the judgement of God, and that
thence

thence it was that they judged these sins worthy of death. Now the judgement of God is, according to righteousness; therefore Justice presseth God on to a prosecuting where ever sin is.

6. Though God, because he hath chosen some to life, will not suffer them to perish, but will bring them to life everlasting, and though he love them so well, that to save them he will give Christ to them and for them, as from *John* 3. 16. is manifest he doth; yet in the giving of Christ he will have such respect to his justice and to his truth, that neither of them may be violated or wronged. Hereto the Apostle gives witnessie, *Rom.* 3. 25, 26. God hath, saith he, set forth Christ to declare his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of them that beleieve in Jesus. God had regard to both these in sending and setting forth Christ, that he might justifie those that he had chosen, and had brought to faith; and that he might be just in so doing, because the sinne that such had commited, or participated in, was worthy of death by Gods owne dome; therefore God minds both, that goodness and righteousness might be exalted together in the same Christ. So in *Gal.* 3. 10. 13. God had an eye to his truth; when he gave Christ; it was written in the Law, that he that continued not in all things contained there, was accursed; and because no man did continue in all things written there.

there, that God in the Law might be true, Christ (whom God selecting love gave to the elect) became accursed for them. Christ therefore died not for any such end as to ratifie the doctrine which he had brought from the Father; for by his miracles he gave sufficient witnesse thereto, nor is this made the end of Christs dying any where in Scripture; but it was to appease God, and to fulfill righteousness.

7. Gods laying the sinnes of the Elect upon Christ, Isa. 53. 6. was in order to satisfaction to God ; It was not only done to assure us that in mercy they are taken away from us , that we might not fear , but might possesse our soules in quietnesse ; but it was done to assure us that in justice and righteousness they are taken away, and upon such termes , as that God is no loser, therefore they were laid upon Christ when he was upon the tree, 1 Pet. 2. 24. to intimate to us that it was to that end that they were laid upon him , that he might there and then satisfie for them; in which regard it is said in Isa. 53. 5. that *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him;* The meaning is , he had wounds and bruises by chastisements , which belonged to us, because of our iniquities, by reason of which God was wrath with us, that he by enduring and bearing them might make peace for us.

8. It is asserted in Scripture that Christ suffered

ed for us, died for us, Rom. 5. 6. 1 Pet. 3. 18. and in many other places, which must not be understood finaliter, as if we onely were the end of Christ's sufferings, and had onely some profit by them; but for us, is as much as in our stead; as when David said of Absalom, *would God I had died for thee*, that is, in thy stead; so it is to be understood in Rom. 5. 6, 7, 8. Scarcely for a righteous man would one die, that is, scarcely in stead of him, to deliver him from death; and so in application to Christ for us, is as much as in his roome, and place, and stead, which further appears, because first the very evils which were due to us Christ endured, as first the wrath of God in his soule, such which the very damned have in hell, but more intolerable; it is said that his soul was heavy unto death, and that on a cold winters day, he did through the meere anguish of his soule, and while he was conflicting with Gods anger, sweat drops of water and blood, notwithstanding all the support he had, which was his fathers immediate stroke; for no hand was upon him at this time but Gods; and it was the torment of the mind that had such an influence upon his body, for his body was put to no paine. Now this wrath was upon him, because wrath was due to us, we were children of wrath, Eph. 2. 3. 2. He endured the curse of the law; and was not the curse of the law our portion for transgression? Col. 3. 10. 3. He suffered

ferred death; and was not death the wages of our sinne? *The wages of sinne is death*, saith the Apostle, *Rom. 6. 23.* Secondly, Christ endured the very evils that were due to us, to deliver us from enduring them, as *I Thes. 1. 10.* *He delivereth us from wrath to come*; it was by his bearing wrath; and from the curse he saves us, that is by becoming a curse, *Gal. 3. 13.* And by death it was that he delivered us from the fear of death, to which we were in bondage, *Heb. 2. 15.* Now if he suffered in stead of us, then it was in a satisfactory way, because our sufferings would have been to satisfie the law, and Gods justice which is in the law; and the damned in hell do suffer for that reason, to pay that debt to justice, which because they can never compleatly do, therefore they do ever suffer.

9. Our salvation which through Christ we partake of, is through redemption, *Rom. 3. 24.* But redemption in a proper acceptation, hath satisfaction in it; for it may be thus described, Redemption is a freeing a captive from the hands of him that detains him, by a price given unto him; as when a person is taken captive by the Turks, there is a price given to him for the freeing of such a person. So it is in the redemption effected by Christ, on the behalfe of the Elect; and there are these following particulars in it.

1. The captives that are detained in bondage
and

and misery, these are those that were appointed unto glory before the world was, but through sin are become captives, *Rom.* 8.21,22,23. *Col.* 1.

13. *Rom.* 7.24,25.

2. The person that detains them in this bondage, this is God; for it is the wrath of God that holds them in it; they are the children of wrath, under the power of wrath, *Ephes.* 2. 3. and they are held under it till they be delivered from it, *1 Thes.*

1. 10. *Rom.* 5. 9. Now wrath relates to God, as the subject in whom it is; for it is God that was wronged, therefore he it is that was offended, and is angry, and whose wrath burnes like fire, till satisfaction be given, and then it is turned away. It is also the justice and judgment of God that detains them, *Rom.* 1. 31. The conscience of the sinner is brought in by the Apostle acknowledging the righteous judgment of God, and subscribing unto this, *that they that commit such things are worthy of death.* It is also the Law that detains them; for the Law worketh wrath, *Rom.* 4. 15. that is, the wrath of God is revealed in the Law against all unrighteousnesse of men, and this worketh disquietnesse in the mind; till the Law be satisfied, God is not satisfied; for the Law is Gods Law, and his righteousnesse in it; and till both the Law, and God the Author of it be satisfied, the prisoner the poore captive must necessarily be detained.

3. The enemies and evils under whom and which

which these Prisoners and Captives are detained, These are Satan, death, the infernal pit, sin. *Acts 26. 18. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Col. 1. 13. Heb. 2. 45.* *Luke 1. 74.* and unto these was man delivered, viz. unto the power of these after he had sinned in and by that sentence of God, viz. in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death, *Gen. 2. 17.* And God hath sovereign power over all these plagues and evils; for though some of them be Gods grand enemies, as well as ours, yet they are Gods servants as well as his enemies, and they do but hold men while Gods will is they should, *Rev. 16. 9. and chap. 19. 10, 15, 14.* And indeed there is no reason but that Gods proceedings must be with men that have sinned, as well as Angels that sinned, till he have satisfaction, but he spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them to chains of darkness to be reserved to judgement, *2 Pet. 2. 4.* Therefore it is he that delivers men to death, and to him that hath the power of death, that is the devil, and to hell also, and those chains of darkness, there to be reserved, till either satisfaction come, or the last doom be passed.

4. The person that redeems these captives from Gods just judgement, and from his wrath, and from these enemies and evils, and this is Christ, *Rom. 5. 9. 1 Thes. 1. 10. Gal. 3. 13. and chap. 4. 4, 5. Luke 1. 69, 70, 71.*

5. The

5. The price that is given by this Redeemer unto God for his satisfaction, *This is the life of Christ.* John 10. 15. *And the blood of Christ,* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. Now that this life of Christ was laid down, and this blood of Christ was shed as a price to ransome the Elect, who were Captives, appears clearly from Mat. 20. 28. and 1 Tim. 2. 6. where it is said, that Christ laid down his life a ransome for many, yea for all the Elect; and the Apostle Peter makes a comparison betwixt this price of Christs blood and a price that is wont to be given for the ransome of Captives in gold and silver, and such corruptible things; and he makes this price of Christs blood farre more precious then the other, 1 Pet. 1. 18. 19. And that this price was given to God, is manifest also from the same place of Peter, where Christs blood is compared to the blood of an immaculate Lambe that hath no blemish nor spot; now such Lambs were trespass-offerings brought to God, who was the person against whom the trespass was committed; and it was for satisfaction in reference to sin committed; and it pointed at Christ, who was indeed the Lambe of God that takes away the sins of all Elect ones in the world, by that satisfaction or price which he gave in his own blood. Also David in his speech to Saul, in 1 Sam. 26. 19. gives witnessse to this truth, that offerings were brought to God, and that

that blood was the price of redemption for sin, given to God: If God have stirred thee up against me being offended at me, (for that is the meaning of it,) let him accept an offering, that is, for satisfaction and pacification let him accept it. But more directly and positively the Author to the Hebrews speaks to this, *Heb. 9. 14.* How much more (saith he) shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences, &c. If then the price of redemption was given to God, God is the person that firstly and principally detains the Elect as Captives in bondage; for he that receives the price is he that holds us in such evil condition, and the redemption is from him, that is from that in him that holds us.

10. The reconciliation which Christ effected through his death and blood, was of God to us, as well as of us to God, which appears from *Rom. 3. 25.* where it is said that God hath set Christ forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. The sense of the Greek word, *ἱαστίγιον*, is *Placamentum*, that by which God is appeased and pacified, who was angry before, and gives answers of peace to his people, when he meets with them, as in *Exod. 25. 17, 21, 22.* God caused a Mercy-seat to be made, it is rendred *propitiatorium*, and is the same word with this of the Apostle, and he caused it

to be put upon the Ark, and there he met with the people, and communed with them in a peaceable way and manner; This was this type of Christ, this appeased God sacramentally, typically, figuratively; Christ properly, really, truly, by his blood, which speaks better things in Gods ears, than the blood of *Abel*, that cryed for vengeance; this cries for pardon, for peace, for reconciliation; therefore the Apostle *John* saith, *If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father who is a Propitiation for our sins*, who expiates our sins by his blood, and so appeaseth God and pacifies him. And by Christ it is said that we receive the attonement that is with God, or we have God attoned to us, *Rom. 5. 11.* for all the offerings of the Old Testament were for attonement, and the people offered them to attone him; God did not offer them to attone them or reconcile them; nor did they offer them to show that they were reconciled to God; for they were offered immediately after they had sinned, and had the sense of their sinne upon their consciences, and knew they had angered God; that by offering them in a beleeving way, looking at Christ the sinne-offering (which they signified) they might appease him and pacifie him, and so might have peace in their owne hearts.

But there are many objections that are framed against this great and weighty truth of Christs making

making satisfaction for the offences of men to God.

Object. 1. It is asserted that there is no such thing read of as satisfaction unto God.

Sol. Though the word it self be not to be found in Scripture, yet the sense of the word is found in many places; that which is equivalent, is found in *Matth. 20. 28.* and *1 Tim. 2. 6.* Christ is said to give his life *λύτρον & αὐτικατεγγυ αὐτιώνων* a ransome for many, which words do signifie the price of redemption, by way of satisfaction, paid for transgression, and the guilt of it. And the righteousnesse of Christ is called in *Rom. 5. 18.* δικαιωμα, which may signifie just satisfaction, in this place most properly, though in some other places it is taken in other senses; for there is an opposition betwixt παρεγνωμα & δικαιωμα, the one is set against the other, the righteousnesse or rather righteous satisfaction of Christ against the offence of *Adam*, and the offence being but one, there is one satisfaction, or satisfaction at once set against it; for the words ought to run, *as by one offence judgment came upon all men so by one just satisfaction the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*

Obj. 2. It is asserted that there is no such thing that we read of in Scripture as the reconciling of God to men, and that it is repugnant to Gods love in giving Christ, that he should give him for that end to reconcile himself to men; for he

shewed himself reconciled to them, in that he gave Christ to them.

Sol. We read of God offended, because of sin; of God threatening man having sinned; of God expelling man from the place where himself had a little before placed him, in his tender love and care over him; and if his setting of Cherubims, and a flaming sword turning every way, to guard the way to the tree of life, which argued a great breach betwixt God and man, and that not only on mans part, but on Gods part; for these were all of them passages of displeasure and anger on Gods part; and we read of the whole posterity of man abiding under wrath, having no other portion but wrath, having the marks of Gods wrath upon them from the womb, *Ephes. 2. 3.* and we read of Gods wrath taken away in Christ by the shedding of his blood; and of the pacification of God towards men through blood, and of his being attoned to men through Christ; and what is all this but the reconciling of God to men?

And though love and anger would have beene *αριστα*, inconsistent together in God, towards the same subject perion or object about which they would be conversant, if sinne had not come betwixt, yet because of sins intervening, there is no more incongruity to say God loved such a creature, and yet is angry with such a creature, then to say a father loves such a child, and yet is angry with such a child, because he hath offended

offended him ; especially when God is wise enough, and knows how to declare his goodness and his righteousness together, and to prosecute his decree of grace in bringing such persons to glory, and to prosecute their sin with wrath, with a curse, and with death at the same time without thwarting with himself ; nor are love and anger opposite to one another, considered in a divers respect; a father loves his child as his child, yet is angry with him as wanton, as forward, as disobedient ; and God loves the elect as elect, as such whom he freely chose and set his heart upon, and yet is angry with them as breaking his Law, and doing things derogatory to his glory.

Obj. 3. It is asserted that redemption is taken in Scripture many times in a metaphorical sense, when only power is put forth to deliver persons from enemies, and an evil state, & no price paid at all ; so in the deliverance from *Egypt*, there was power exercised against *Pharaoh* and his Realm, by which *Israel* was fetched out from bondage, but no price paid to any, yet it is called redemption in many places, and *Moses* a Redeemer, *Acts* 7. 35. And because this deliverance from *Egypt* was a type of the spiritual deliverance which comes by Christ, and *Moses* a type of Christ in this deliverance, therefore the deliverance which is effected by Christ, is not redemption by any price paid to God, but in a

metaphorical sense, by power put forth against Satan, death, hell, all enemies that detained the Elect.

Sol. Though redemption be taken metaphorically in some places of Scriptures, yet it follows not it should be taken so in all places; and though external deliverances are many times by power only, and without price, it will not therefore follow that this great spiritual and eternal deliverance must be a deliverance of the same kind; And though this temporal deliverance from *Egypt* be a type of this spiritual by Christ from sin, and death, and hell: yet it follows not that therefore there must be a similitude and parity in all things betwixt them; and though *Moses* be a type of Christ, yet the type reacheth not the perfection of the thing typified; it is clear in the person of *Moses* compared with the person of Christ: and it is as clear in the redemption that *Moses* effected from God, which was from outward servitude and bondage, and that redemption which was wrought by Christ, which was from hell and from the devil. There are many dissimilitudes betwixt the one redemption and the other; and this is one, that there is no price paid in the one but power used, but in the other there was both. And to convince of this the better, consider, the one was without blood, for there needed none; but the other must be with blood, for

for there could be no remission without it, *Heb.* 9. 22. The one was without the intervening of the Redeemer, in the place and room of the redeemed; *Moses* was not to be in bondage, in the room and & place stead of those that were by him to be redeemed from bondage; but in this spiritual deliverance it must be so; the Redeemer must be in the condition that the redeemed were in; Christ must come in the room of sinners, and must bear their sins, and suffer their plagues instead of them, as hath been proved. And the reason of this difference is, because *Moses* had not in the redemption of *Israel*, any thing to do with an offended God, who had a controversie against the people whom *Moses* was to redeem, and from whom he would have satisfaction before he would save them; for then in such a case against the enemy that held them, power would not have been sufficient for their deliverance, but a price would have been required; but Christ in his redemption hath to do with Gods wrath, and anger, and with Gods righteousness, which were shewed and revealed against the Elect; for the Elect had sinned, whom he was to redeem; and God had threatened they should die the death, and they had deserved it, and God must be just and true in what he had said; therefore Christ must first prevail with God in the deliverance of this people, before he could exercise any power against the

devil, or death, or hell ; and this prevailing must be by a price paid to satisfie for transgression; for it could not be by power; God might be appeased, but overcome he could not be, as those enemies must, whom he was to deliver the Elect from. This hath all been shewed already, and this is it that makes the disparity betwixt the two deliverances which do typifie one the other.

Object. 4. It is asserted in Scripture that redemption in Scripture is never said to be from God, as it must needs be, were any price paid to God, or satisfaction given to God; but redemption is said to be from Satan, *Acts* 26. 18. from death, *Heb.* 2. 14, 15. from the power of darknesse, *Col.* 1. 13. from our vain conversation, *1 Pet.* 1. 18. from iniquity, *Tit.* 2. 14. yea it is so farre from being a redemption from God, that it is a redemption to God, *Rev.* 14. 4.

Sol. Redemption in Scripture, though it be nowhere said in so many words to be from God, yet it is said to be from the wrath of God, from the judgement of God, from the curse of God; the Laws curse is Gods curse, and so in a sense redemption is from God, as an enemy and an Avenger; it is from God as a Judge, whose office is to search out iniquity, and to passe sentence according to the Law, and hath his officers to attend upon him, to whom he delivers up the sinner and offender; from God as such an one the redemption of Christ

Christ is, but not from God in reference to relation, interest, communion, fellowship, acquaintance, dependance, power, and dispose, &c. for in all these respects redemption is to God, and not from him.

Though Redemption be from Sin, Satan, the world, death, hell, and all such enemies and evils, yet it is to be understood, that it is from these only as the lesse principal causes of the detention of Gods Elect in bondage; even as when a person is delivered from the Gaole, he is delivered from the Gaoler, & from the dungeon or pit into which he was cast, and from his bolts, and chains, and from all the noisomenesse, and filthinesse, and nastinessse, that attends that condition; yet these are but the lesse principal causes of the evils; he is firstly and principally delivered from his Creditor and the Judge, that committed him to these; So it is in this case; God is the principal person that detains, and the rest that are mentioned in Scripture are but his servants. The devil is as the officer that receives persons that are sentenced of God into his custody; sin is but as the fetters and cords in which such persons are held, the world is but as the prison, and death is but as the torments persons are put to; but properly we are Gods Captives, and are doomed and sentenced of God to banishment from his presence, as Cain was, and are delivered up to the power and dispose

pose of the God of this world ; For 1. God is the Sovereign Lord, and supream Monarch and Judge, and the power primarily belongs to him to cast body and soule into hell. 2. Men are guilty of that which they call *crimen lese maiestatis*, or treason against divine Majesty; *Against thee, thee only I have sinned*, said David, therefore worthy to be rejected.

3. Therefore they are by nature children of wrath, *The wrath of God is revealed from heaven*; Upon those that beleeves not, *the wrath of God abides*; 4. We ask to be loosed and discharged from our sins, not from Satan, but from God, and to be loosed from the bonds and snares of hell and death ; therefore primarily we are held in bondage to God, and not to Satan or any other. Hereto agrees the witnessse of Scripture, *God hath shut up all in unbelief*, that he might have mercy upon all, Rom. 11. 32. The Scripture, that is God in the Scripture, hath shut up all under sinne, that the promise of faith through Iesus Christ might be given unto them that beleieve, Gal. 3. 22. God gave some up to vile affections, Rom. 1. 26. and verse 23. because they liked not to retain God in their thoughts, therefore God gave them up to a reprobate mind, God gave them up to worship the Host of Heaven, Acts 7. 42. The Parable of the King that was wrath with him that was unmerciful to his fellow-servant, is pertinent to the same purpose, he de-

li-

livered him to the tormentors, *Matth.* 18. 34. And that exhortation of Christ, *To agree with our adversary while in the way, lest the judge deliver to the officer, &c.* Which places do all shew that we through sin are primarily the Captives of God, as a King and Judge offended; and that only secondarily we are Captives to the devil and other enemies as to Gods Ministers and Servants, though enemies, to which we are committed; for without commission and permission we are taught, that the greatest tyrants can effect nothing against Gods Elect; and the very devils themselves, could not go into the herd of swine without leave; therefore the price paid to God to satisfie him is the principal thing in redemption.

It is also to be understood, that these two, *To be redeemed from God, and to be redeemed to God,* will consist very well together; for the captivity of the Elect, is not like the captivation of a person taken in war, and detained by the enemy, from whom when he is redeemed, he is totally alienated and separated, and hath no more to do with him: nor is it like the captivation of a person, who is violently and unjustly detained in the hand of a cruel one, who tyrannizeth over him after the manner of *Pharaoh*, who laid unjustly heavy burdens upon the children of *Israel*, from whom (if he be once freed) he is totally withdrawn from such an one, and divided, never

ver to come into his hands or power any more. But the captivity of the Elect is as when a subject for some offence against his Prince, is delivered into the Serjeants hand, or into some other officers custody and power, to be imprisoned, or scourged, or punished with death, according to the nature of the offence, unlesse satisfaction be given, and he be released upon that account; such a redemption as this is, viz. of a subject from the wrath of his Prince, is not the alienation of the subject from his Prince, but the reconciliation of him to his Prince; and the person that is redeemed from, is redeemed to man; for these do consist well enough together, from the wrath and justice of the Prince, to the love and favour of the Prince he is redeemed. And though God offended, doth deliver the Elect to enemies, and not to subjects; for the devil is an enemy both to God and to the Elect, and not a subject, yet this makes no difference but that the Elects captivation may fitly be resembled captivation of a subject to his own Prince, because God is the Lord of devils, and they as truly subject, (though not as willingly subject) as any other that are under Gods power.

Object. 5. It is further asserted, that it is God that gave Christ to redeem men, and if there be any satisfaction given to God by Christ, God himself is the author of it, and gave it to himself; if he gave it to himself, he was satisfied before, and

and the price moves him nothing , to release the captive , because it is not from the captive , but from himself , and of his own providing ; and nothing is added to God by it , for it is but Gods satisfying of himself . And what a kinde of satisfaction is this ? In the truth of the thing it is as no satisfaction ; for if the satisfaction must come out of himself , he is satisfied in himself , without any satisfaction from the captive .

Sol. God must be looked upon as one that dearly loves the captivated elect persons , who had sinned against him , and would not have them perish ; and withal he must be looked upon as one that dearly loved justice and truth , and cannot suffer either of them to be violated ; for they are himself , as dear to him as himself ; therefore he provides that Justice and Truth , and the life and welfare of such poor captives , may consist together ; and because he sees it impossible by any thing that the elect can do , who had offended , because they are without strength , and can make no satisfaction for any trespass , therefore he himself in his wisdome and love to the Elect , and in his love to Justice and Truth , findes out a way to save them from ruine , and to satisfie these . And that is by Christ , whom he sends ; and this is all his designe , and he lookes for no further gain , nor advantage to himself , but that his goodnesse and righteousness and truth might be glorified together , in the salvation of the Elect ,
that

that had sinned; for what standeth God in need of, and what can be given to him for satisfaction, which may be added to his store? If his justice and truth in reference to his law be maintained, and kept on foot, with his love to those whom he hath chosen, this is more to him then all the earth and the fulnesse of it; and other satisfaction he looks for none. The declaration of his justice and truth is satisfaction enough, and a motive strong enough to let the captive go free, and this he obtained by the intervention of the death and blood of his Son. What advantage had *Zalencus*, who made a law that adulterers should lose both their eyes, and he to satisfie this law, that he might be accounted just and impartiall therein, when his son (whom he loved had offended by adultery) caused one of his sons eyes, and another of his own, to be put out, save only the praise of his justice and truth in his lawes? and this is that which God grieves at. And if the Judge, loving the prisoner that is before him, and knowing he hath nothing to pay, and yet the law recovers payment, will give his own son to be his surety, and will lay the debt upon him, and is content that his son shall fetch the price out of his own treasure, yet the law is satisfied, and the judges righteousness in reference unto it, and his love to the Prisoner are glorified.

Nor is the satisfaction the lesse, because God
the

the offended person procures it , and not man that offended him ; for the truth of God stands firme by that means, and the law takes place, and is not made of none effect, as it would have been, had no satisfaction been given , which would have redounded to Gods dishonour ; Yea, the righteousnesse of God and his love to undeserving creatures shines forth , because the satisfaction is of Gods own procuring.

And though it proceed from God , yet it cannot be said that God satisfies himself , or that he was satisfied before; for he that provides it, doth not act it , but it is acted in and by an other person. The Father sends the Son , and the Father in the Son receives satisfaction ; and though the Father and Son be the same God , yet they are not the same person, nor is the satisfaction that the Son gives (materially considered) given in the divine nature, or God-head , but the Sonne took flesh, and in that flesh by dying and sheding his blood , gave satisfaction ; so that it is from God, but not in God , if we speak of the next and immediate subject , which is the man-hood, if the matter of the satisfaction be respected.

And though it may be said that God was satisfied before in reference to his own love to such persons, he did not repent of it in such sort as to cast them off , nor was his purpose of glorifying them one whit shaken , yet he was not satisfied after they had sinned , and after he had sentenced

ced them to death, in point of righteousness and truth, to passe by their transgression without satisfaction; his Law was not satisfied in a free forgivenesse without satisfaction, and so God was unsatisfied, because the Law was.

Object. 6. It is likewise asserted, that there is an unsatisfied conscience in men; men having sinned, cannot discerne how Gods heart can be towards them without satisfaction; therefore the Scripture speaks of propitiation through Christs blood, and of atonement by his death, condescending therein to mans infirmity, which could not otherwise apprehend how God could communicate life and glory to men after they had sinned, without being first appeased and pacified by Christs blood: But if things be rightly considered in themselves, as in truth they are, Christ dyed not to reconcile us to God, but to heal us of an evill conscience, and that we might know that God loved us after we had sinned, as well as he did before, by the gift of Christ, who is the manifestation of the Fathers love after the fall which the Elect could not be perswaded of, but by a pledge of it; Therefore it is laid that Christ shed his bloud to purge our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God, *Heb. 9.14.* and not to satisfie God.

Sol. It will readily be confessed, that it was an end of Christs dying, to reconcile men to God, and that they might have the answer of a good con-

consciene before God, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But that this was the solitary end, or the principall end, or that satisfaction to God is no end, but is wholly excluded, is denied, and hath been disproved all along in the discourse upon this subject.

1. What need would there have been that Christ should have dyed at all, if only satisfaction to mens consciences concerning Gods goodnessse and love to fallen creatures had been intended therein. For God could best have done that by his spirit, and must yet do it by his spirit, if it be ever done in the hearts of men. Indeed God having given Christ, and delivered him up to death, the spirit represents it as a great manifestation of the Fathers love, but the spirit might have abundantly assured the heart of a sinner of the Fathers love without it, so that there was no necessity of Christs dying in that regard.

2. The love of God represented unto men in giving Christ, is much lessened to them in the representation, if Christ were only given to satisfie their hearts in reference to their fears of God, & not to satisfie Gods justice; if there were no need of Christ, in reference to any danger they were in, in regard of God, if God could or would have pardoned sin without him, and his justice and truth could have remitted it.

3. It is derogatorie to Gods wisdome and love to assert that Christ was delivered up to be crucified upon the crosse, and there to shed his blood principally for this end, to cure mans panique fears and his groundlesse, causeles suspicions of God, and not from any necessity that there was in mans evill condition,

in regard of sin committed by him, and of Gods righ-teousnesse and truth prosecuting it against him. For God might have done this in an easier way, and have spared his dear Son. God is represented prodigall of his dear Sons bloud, if he must die and bleed out his spirits, to cure some false conceits that men have entertained of God.

4. What need was there that the Son should come in flesh, and should empty himself of his glory , and that he that is the Lord of glory should be crucified, if no satisfaction to divine justice was looked at, but only the satisfaction of the conscience ? the bloud of God (as it is called) would not have been necessary, but the bloud of a meer creature Christ, wou'd have served the turne for such a purpose, had that been all.

5. How came those fears in the heart of man after the fall, after sinne committed ? What bred them ? was there no ground for them? were they meer con-ceipts and jealousies that wanted a right bottom? did not the threatening before sinne was committed, cause the horours and terrors that were in the soul after sinne was committed ? and if they had Gods threat-ning as the ground of them, viz. *in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye the death,* were they not well grounded? and was it possible that these fears should be cured by the bloud of Christ, and the cause not re-moved by the bloud of Christ; the threatening not ta-ken away, the truth of God and his righteousnes not fulfilled and satisfied, which were in the threatening and which bred the feares ?

6. These fears and terrors of the Elect, before Christs blood

bloud be brought to their hearts to remove them, are they not of the same nature with the horrores of the reprobate in hell? And if so, are not both the one and the other that wrath of God which God poures into the soul because of sinne which he prosecutes against men? are they not punishments for sin from God? is not Gods righteousnesse therein revealed against sin, & the truth of God in the threatening fulfilled, which did reach to both Elect and Reprobate? And if so, how can God remove them from the Elect through Christ, without satisfaction given by Christ, and yet suffer them to lie upon the Reprobate, without palpable unrighteousnesse and untruth, when the threatening, viz. *Thou shalt dye the death*, extended to all mankinde in Adams loynes without exception?

7. How may Scripture come to be eluded, and the strength and force of it infringed in all other cases, if plain pregnant places of it may be evaded after this manner, as when it is said, God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation, that is, to be one that appeaseth God, Rom. 3.25. and by Christ we have received the attonement; Rom. 5.11. that is, we have received God attoned to us; for all the offerings in the Law were to attone God to men that had sinned; if such an answer may be taken and may passe: *God doth in these expressions condescend to mans infirmity, who thinks God to be angry, and had need to be appeased and reconciled;* how easie would it be to wrest and pervert all Scripture? By this that hath been represented, it appears that some satisfaction to God is necessary to be given by Christ, and the contrary

doctrine is dangerous and desperate, and overthrows our justification ; for if God be not satisfied for our sins , they are not pardoned, and we are yet in our sins; and this doctrine that thus oppugnes Christs satisfaction, doth deny Christ to have bought us; for if he payed not any price to God for us , I am sure he paid none to the devill, nor to any other enemy; for he conquered them by force and power and might, and paid not any price to them; therefore it utterly overthrows Christs purchase of the Elect; and yet (which is much to be lamented) this doctrine spreads very much and corrupts very many.

Q. 2. The second thing that I promised to speak to, is this, that seeing some satisfaction must be given to God, in reference to a trespass committed, and an offence taken, and a threatening given out upon opposition, and afterward inflicted upon the perpetration of such an evill, what satisfaction it is that is necessarie : whether any satisfaction will serve, or whether it must be a proportionable satisfaction.

Sol. 1. It cannot be denied but that God is the soveraigne Lord over all, and hath none above him to appoint him, or to enjoyne him, to give rules and laws to him, how he ought to walk towards the creature; none can limit or restraine him, or set bounds unto him; but his will (which is always holy and just and good) is the rule that he acts by ; and he doth whatsoever pleaseth him, *Ps. 115.3.* & further then he sets bounds to himself, he cannot be bound up to any thing, or by any one; and further then he restrains and limits himself , he cannot be restrained and limited
by

by any other. Therefore he might at the first (if it had pleased him) have pardoned sin without satisfaction; or he might have accounted that for satisfactiō, which himself would accept for satisfaction, be it more or lesse; and so the blood of bulls and goats might have satisfied as well as the blood of a man, and the blood of a meer man (such as my Antagonist would have Christ to be) as well as the blood of Christ who is God and man; but this comes not home to the point; for we are to consider what satisfaction is now necessary, & not what might at first have been accepted of.

2. Satisfaction that will now be admitted of and accepted, is satisfaction according to the Law, that holds proportion to it; for the Law is Gods Law, which flowed from Gods righteousness and holiness, and in which, and to which, God hath limited himself, and bound up himself, so that God must deny his own Law, and his own Truth, righteousness and holiness that is in it, if he do in the least kind wave that satisfaction that it requires. Now the law to *Adam* (which compriseth all his posterity) was, *I hou shalt not eat, &c for if thou do eat, thou shalt surely dye; & that soul that sins, shall dye; and cursed is every one that continues not in all things written in the Law, to do the same.* Therefore the satisfaction could not have been lesse then death, or lesse then the curse of the Law, what ever that evil is that is understood by death, or by the curse.

3. What ever that evill is that reprobated persons doe or shall endure, upon whom the curse of the law is laid, and the death threatned, lighteth because they were in *Adams* loynes, when he fell under the threatening

ning of death , and because they continued not in all things written in the Law, and so incurred the curse ; I say what ever the anguish,torture and torment is,either in mind or body,which such persons pass,or must pass,abide, or must abide under at present,or hereafter, the like punishment in all degrees,without any abatement, have the Elect merited and deserved, being in the same state and condition with the Reprobate, being equally in the loynes of *Adam* with him , and not abiding any more then he did in all things written in the Law ; and if there be deliverance for the Elect, and the Law in the death and curse of it be not laid,nor doth light upon them, but satisfaction is made in Christ for them , then it must be a proportionable satisfaction that must be given to God , in reference to which God doth remit such pains of hell , such everlasting destruction and perdition, and doth release the Elect from them ; that is , Christ must suffer the whole, and the full, of that which either any, or all the Elect have deserved , and from which they are acquitted and discharged in Christ; Christ must satisfie as far as the guilt of all and every of the Elect extends to, which is as great as the light of the Reprobate, and so Christs sufferings in one kind or other , must be equivalent to the eternal damnation of all the Elect, from which they are discharged by his sufferings, equivalent unto those exquisite torments which the damned in hell do, or shal suffer, which the Elect had merited as well as they.

The consequence of this, is, that Christs sufferings were not the iusserings of a meer man; for had Christ been

been but a meer man , his sufferings for all the Elect could not have been proportionable to their guilt & demerit. For the righteous God (which without respect of persons, had laid all men under the same curse and wrath , because of the same sin and guilt, which without difference, all were under) could not save by Christ without transmitting that curse and wrath which was due to all and every of the Elect to Christ. and if Christ had been but a meer man, then there would have been need of so many Christsto have suffered and endured as there are Elect persons; and every one of these Christs must have suffered hel, *viz.* the torments of hell as well as death, and then they must have suffered ever also, without any end, and yet could not have justified the Elect, because while they should be suffering till that be ended, God could not be satisfied; and if God could not be satisfied, the Elect could not be justified and discharged , and so to all eternity the Elect could not be acquitted; and this appears in Christ , if he had suffered and had never got through his suffering we had never been saved; if he had dyed, and had never risen, we had never risen to life and glory.

And this is that which I presented , in that Argument or Instance (as he calls it) of mine, *viz.* that the satisfaction which Christ gave to Gods justice is destroyed , if Christ be but a meer man and not God ; for how could the blood of a man satisfie for the sins of many transgressours , whereas there is no proportion betwixt one meer man dying for sin, and many men sinning and deserving death, each of them for the sins they have committed?

The righteousnesse is in Scripture called *δικαιουα*, Rom. 5. 18. which signifies a just satisfaction, or satisfaction according to the exactnesse of justice; and Gods scope is thereby to declare himself just, that is to magnifie his justice thereby, Rom. 3. 26.

By all this that hath been presented, it appeares how sleight and weak he is in his answer to an Argument of the highest weight, and moment. For what thing is there of greater consequence for the satisfying of the conscience, then to know that the satisfaction is full and sufficient, which Christ hath given? which was shewed by the Argument that I brought, to be disproportional upon his Tenent of Christs meer creatureship, to which he returnes no other answer but this: As the sin of one meere man was imputed unto, and brought death upon all men: even so the gift of grace by one man Jesus Christ (whom he makes but a meer man) abounded unto many unto justification and life; In the next place he comes to discuse and give answer to my 2^d Querie.

How it may be conceivable that an infinite justice offended should be satisfied by a sacrifice finite in value?

And thus he expresseth himself.

What matters it if it be unconceivable? must it therefore be uncredible? doubtlesse, in all controversiall doctrines you will not hold this for an orthodoxall Tenent: In the doctrine of the Trinity, credit must be given to things unconceiveable; but the like liberty will not be allowed in Christs Mediatorship.

Reply. i. If no more words had been added by me to these expressions, It is unconceivable, yet if there be

be a truth therein, that it is unconceivable, these bare expressions (without any addition) might have passed with him for an unanswerable Argument, because he professeth himself to be a man so given up to reason, that he will prostrate himself (to use his own expressions) to the shadow of it, and his faith will not carry him beyond reason, how shallow soever his apprehension is ; he will not beleieve further then he can see, which hath caused him to be so unsettled and unstable in the doctrine of the Trinity, and to question it so long, till at last he hath rejected it.

2. That which is unconceivable, and wants the authority of Scripture so to countenance it, is not receivable. So did not the doctrine of the Trinity; for though it be an incomprehensible mystery, yet it is not an unscriptural doctrine, but it is compassed about with a cloud of witnesses, both of the old and new Testament, which do declare it with the greatest clearnes ; but that such a thing should be in Christ's Mediatorship, that that which is finite in nature & value, should yet satisfie for that which is infinite in provocation and offence, hath neither the light of reason, nor the truth of Scripture to draw out consent unto it, & therfore is worthy to be expunged out of the Saints beliefs.

3. That which is unconceivable & against the tenor of the Scripture (which words I added, but he would take no notice therof) deservs no credit with Christians, but must be razed from among the articles of their faith; but that a sacrifice that is finite in value, should satisfie an infinite Justice offended, is both incomprehensible by reason, and contradictory to Scripture, as

appears from *Heb. 9. 9.* *Gifts and Sacrifices while the first Tabernacle was standing were offered, which could not make him that did the service perfect : it could not purge away his sin nor justify him;* what was the reason of it ? could not God have taken these gifts and sacrifices for satisfaction ? no, he could not; the Apostle saith it could not be; there was no proportion; an offence against God must be purged away with better sacrifices then these; *T^t Apostle that was of Gods counsel, and knew the truth, tells us so, Heb. 9. 23.* It was necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices : then these: why necessary ? because the justice of God could not be satisfied by these, nor the truth of God fulfilled; therefore it was necessary there should be better then these: but if these better be not proportionable to the offence, to purge the guilt away, in a satisfactory way to justice, wherin is the betternes betwixt them? there is no difference : in this respect they are alike, without preheminence one to the other. He repeats it again, *Heb. 10. 1.* as that which is of weighty consideration, and which he would have the Christian Hebrews to be throughly instructed in. *The Law (saith he) having a shadow of good things to come, can never with those sacrifices which they offered, make the comers thereto perfect;* and v. 4. *It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin ;* It was possible at first; but after God had said, *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death,* it was not possible; after the law had cursed every one that continues
not

not in all things written therein, it was not possible; and the Apostle fetcheth his confirmation from Christ's own words in *Ps. 40.* which he mentions and applies to this purpose, v. 5. *Wherefore, he saith, when he cometh into the world, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared; in burnt offering and sacrifice thou delightest not; then said I, loe I come to do thy will O God.* Why would not God have sacrifice, but prepared a body for his Son? the reason is, because this flesh of Christ is called a greater, and more perfect Tabernacle, by which being sacrificed and offered up to God, he entred heaven, and opened it for beleevers. It is called a greater Tabernacle, because it was not of this building, not framed of the seed of male and female, as other bodies are, but of another building, as the Apostle observes, *Heb. 9. 11.* conceived in the wombe of a Virgin, by the over shadowing of the Holy Ghost; and it was greater also, because, not the glory of the Lord filled it only, as it did the Tabernacle made in the wildernesle, but because the fulnes of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily, and by this greater Tabernacle he obtained eternal redemption for us, and entred into heaven to take possession of glory for us. Why did not God delight in burnt-offering, but Christ must come? the reason is rendred, it was to do the Will of God. The Will of God was to have his truth satisfied, his law satisfied, his righteousesse satisfied, that upon just, and holy, and honourable termes he might be reconciled; this was the Will of God. This Will burnt-offerings and sin-offerings could not accomplish; Christ must therefore come

come to satisfie it and to fulfil it. Therefore it is said *Not by the blood of Goats and Calves, but by his own blood he entred once into the holy place*, Heb.9.12. and in ver. 13, 14. it is said, *If the blood of Bulls and Goats do cleanse the flesh*(being types of the blood of Christ) *how much rather shal the blood of Christ clese the conscience?* If all had depended upon institution, and that there had been no respect had by God of a full satisfaction: the blood of bulls and goats, might have been as effectual to have clenched, not the outside, but the conscience, equally as the blood of Christ, if the vertue of clensing had not depended upon the excellency of the person, whose blood it was that did clese: there would have been no difference betwixt the bloods that did clese: therefore the value of the blood in reference to the person whose it was, falleth under the consideration of God in the busines of remission. But he saith, *The foundation that I build upon, is not a little questionable, and that not a few errors do lie under my non scriptural language.*

You tell us (saith he) of an infinite sacrifice; but what you mean by it, and where Scripture tells us so much, I am yet for to learne; The Scripture tells us that Christ was made sin (or a sin offering) for us by taking our sins and bearing the curse; but how this sacrifice was infinite, remains to me unconceivable. If the suffering of Christ had been infinite, there had been no end of it; if the curse had been infinite, man could not have born it, being uncapable of any thing infinite in the infinity of it. It is enough for me to beleve that my Lord Jesus suffered for

for me, what I deserved to suffer, and that was the curse of the Law, be that what it will.

Rep. The foundation which I build upon, wil admit of his utmost questioning, without being shaken thereby. As for the errors that may lie under my words, he might have done well to have presented them unto view, yea I beleeve he hath done it, so far as his fancy hath suggested any to him; which whether they will prove to be errors, when I shall have represented what I am able to say, will be judged of by the Reader; and whether my language be unscriptural in the sense of it, or his answer be not impertinent, and no answer to any thing wherin the strength of my Argument lies, or whether it be not rather a shuffling and a shifting, then an answering, let any intelligent impartial person judge.

He hath been wont to draw up my Arguments into form when he hath apprehended an advantage by it; but at other times preterms its; I shall therfore do it for him at this time; he calls it a Querie, and it runs in that form, but the strength of this Argument is in it.

If Christ be a meer creature, then a sacrifice finite in value, wil be able to satisfie an infinite justice offended; but a sacrifice finite in value, cannot satisfie an infinite justice offended; ergo Christ is not a meer creature.

He answers not to either of these propositions, nor indeed can do, without running into absurdities; for first the consequence is firme and good, which will be manifest if these five things be made out. 1, That the sa-

sacrifice of a meer creature neither is nor can be any other then finite in value, which none wil doubt of, if they consider that a meer creature is only finite, and can be nothing more; and if so, then the actings of it are according to the nature of it finite also, both in their nature, and in their value & worth; for nothing can act beyond it self; and this I beleeve he will not deny. 2. That the justice of god is infinite, which because it is an attribute of God, and is God (for what ever is in God is God) must needs be granted, because God himself is infinite; and indeed God cannot be compounded of things that are finite; for an infinite being is never made up of finite things, so that all in God is infinite. And that which is finite, is limited; and that which is limited, is limited by another which is greater then it, and can limit it; but both these are incompetent to God, who is greater then all, & limits all, but is limited of none. 3. That this infinite justice was offended, which is manifest, because 1. a just and holy law was broken; 2. a righteous and just penalty proposed to warn man lest he should transgress, was slighted and despised; 3. man was immediately upon the transgression judged and sentenced with death, and expulsed Paradise; 4 because this law was Gods which was transgresed, and the penalty that was threatned and was despised, was Gods also, therefore the offence in transgressing and despising was infinite, though not in the nature of it, yet in relation to such a God who is infinite; which will farther appear, if this be granted, which in reason cannot be denied, that faults committed receive their aggravation as from

the

the matter and manner of committing, and from the end and design, so from the object or person against whom committed; the greater & more excellent the person is, against whom the transgression is, the greater is the transgression; therfore if against a Prince, it is an high aggravation, and it counted treason, and a more grievous death is inflicted; and if it be an high crime against him, it is endeavoured that his death may be perpetuated; therefore his torments are prolonged, and this is judged righteousnesse in the persons that inflict such punishment in reference to such transgression; and yet the highest of men are persons that must die, and their breath is in their nostrils; and they are not only finite, but their life is like bubbles upon the water, and in comparison of God they are but as Wormes and Grashoppers. What then if the fault be against God, who is the Prince of all Princes, and before whom the highest is but as the dust of the ballance, who is infinite in his nature and in all his attributes; the guilt of such a fault will be according to the person, infinite, as the person is; and hence it is that it cannot be expiated by persons that commit a fault against God, no not by sufferings; therefore the wicked and ungodly suffer for ever, because they can never suffer enough, in any time; to give satisfaction to God for their transgression, therefore they must always suffer, and there must be infinity in their suffering, so far as they are capable of infinity; we say that that which hath no end, is infinite; but the sufferings of the Reprobate have no end; This comes from the Justice of the infinite God, which in punishing the creature that sins against him, considers the infinite distance that is betwixt him and it, and makes the punishment proportionable, which made Eli say to his sons, *If a man sinne against a man, the Judge shall judge him, but if man sinne against the Lord, who shall intreat for him?* the distance is such that there is no mediatour that the creature can find out for him, but he is punished with everlasting destruction

ction from the presence of the Lord. 4. That sacrifice is something that was ordained of God to satisfie the justice of God, which must needs be confessed, if it can be proved that God was attoned, appeased, pacified by sacrifice, and that transgressions against God, which carry infinite guilt in them are remitted by them; but this is manifest from many places of Scripture, *Lev. 1. 4. and chap. 4. 26, 31, 34.* and divers others. 5. The sacrifice that Christ offered to God, when he offered himself to God, was sufficient to satisfie Gods justice, though infinitely wronged, and offended by the Elects transgressions, *Rom. 8. 33, 34.* *Who can lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? it is God that justifieth;* but how can that be when so just and so holy a law hath been transgressed, and the justice of God calling upon God for satisfaction? The Apostle answers it in the next words, *who can condemne? it is Christ that died, or rather that is risen again.* This imports that Christ by dying hath given such satisfaction that nothing can condemne; the Law that was transgressed cannot, Gods justice cannot, *Heb. 9. 26.* *Christ bath once in the end of the world appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself,* and ver. 12. *Christ by his own blood entred once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.*

The minor Proposition or the Assumption is undeniable, and needs no proof, which is this; *A sacrifice finite in value, cannot satisfie an infinite justice offended;* for there must be some proportion betwixt the offence by which infinite justice is ingaged against persons that commit it, and the satisfaction that is tendered and given to justice so ingaged, in reference to transgression; but what proportion betwixt a finite sacrifice of a finite value and virtue, and infinite justice moved, stirred, offended, and ingaged against men?

Now unto this Argument there is no answer returned, but some little arguing there is against an infinite sacrifice, which is rather a denying of the conclusion, then an answering to any premise of the Argument. Notwithstanding it is necessary that I consider what he objecteth against the thing which I drive at, though he comes not near the Argument, which I propounded to arrive at it.

Repl. How doth that appear in my expressi-
ons, when I onely ask a question how a Sacri-
fice finite in value, can satisfie an infinite Justice
offended ? And in steed of answering it, there is
deep silence, he passeth it over as if he had not
observed it.

Yet he saith, *The Scripture tells us that Christ
was made sin, or a sin-offering for us, by taking
our sins, and bearing the Curse : but how this
Sacrifice was infinite, to me is unconceivable.*

Repl. And doth not the Scripture tell us,
that the person that was made this sin-offering
was God ? therefore his bloud is called *the
bloud of God*, *Acts 20. 28.* was the Lord of
glory ; therefore it is said, *had they known him,
they would never have crucified the Lord of
glory* : now this is the Title of the most high
God, *Psal. 24. 7. Psal. 29. 3.* Was the great
Shepherd of the sheep ; yea the chief Shep-
herd ; which is equivalent to the most high
God : for the most high is familiarly in Scri-
pture called a Shepherd. *Psal. 23. 1, and Psal.
80. 1.* And if so, then he is chief Shepherd ;
and if chief Shepherd, then Christ is he, because
there are not two chief Shepherds, but one chief
Shepherd ; and so the Father and Christ are
one and the same chief Shepherd. *Heb. 13. 20.
1 Pet. 5. 4.* The great or chief Shepherd is said
to be brought again from the dead by the Fa-
ther : so that the person that was this sin-offer-

ing, was as great, as high, as excellent, as can be imagined ; as high as the highest, infinitely high and great, as these Scriptures do declare ; for such a person according to the flesh that he assumed, was crucified, did shed his bloud, was raised again by the Father, in some places of Scripture, by himself in other ; for the Father and he work the same works ; the Father raiseth the dead, yea the dead body of Christ ; and the Son raiseth the dead, and his own dead body also ; as hath been shewed before.

Yea further, Doth not the Scripture tell us, that Christ through the eternal Spirit offered up himself without spot to God, and that his blood in this regard is made more effectual for the purging away of sin, than the bloud of Buils and Goats ? *Heb. 9. 14. How much more (saith the Apostle) shall the bloud of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered up himself to God, purge your Consciences from dead works to serve the living God ?* In this Scripture here is both the Sacrifice and the Priest that offered it. Christ according to his Humanity is the sacrifice ; it was himself according to the Flesh that was offered up : and Christ according to his Divinity or Deity was the Priest that offered up him according to the Flesh. It is said that Christ did it through the Eternal Spirit ; What is this Eternal Spirit ? It was not the soul of Christ ; for first, The soul of Christ is not properly

perly eternal, no more then he will grant the sufferings of the creature in hell to be infinite ; and yet they never shall have end : that is properly eternal which neither hath beginning nor ending, and so cannot be measured : and therefore nothing can be said to be past, and nothing future and to come, in that which is eternal ; and eternity is one of the Attributes of the most high God, and incommunicable to the creature ; though sometimes that which hath no end is said (but very improperly) to be eternal.

2. The soul of Christ may be said to be a part of the sacrifice that Christ offered up to God by or through the eternal Spirit ; for though he suffered in the flesh, and shed his bloud according to the flesh, yet he suffered in the soul, bore the wrath of God in the soul, and the curse of sin lay upon the soul as well as upon the body ; therefore the soul as well as the body was in a sense offered up to God ; and therefore both of them are distinct from the eternal spirit that is here spoken of, by which it is said he offered up himself ; that which was offered, and that by which it was offered, are different things from one another. 3. When Christ speaks of his soul, he calls it Spirit, without adding the Epithite of Eternal to it. *Luke 22. 46.* 4. The souls of men may be as properly and truly called eternal Spirits, as the soul of Christ be called an eternal Spirit, being of the

same nature both the one and the other : But where is such an Adjective added to them in Scripture, as Eternal ?

Nor can the Spirit of God be meant by this eternal spirit ; for Christ in reference to the eternal spirit, is made the Priest and the Efficient that offered up to God that which was offered up, *viz.* the whole Humane Nature of Christ consisting of soul and body ; though Scripture speak most of the body in which he dyed and shed his bloud. For this Pronoun *who*, points at somthing in Christ besides soul and body which was offered to God ; which did slay the sacrifice, and offer it up : and this can be nothing but the eternal spirit in Christ, the Deity of Christ, by which spirit he went and preached to the spirits in prison in the days of *Noah*, before he had either soul or body ; and by which spirit he searcheth the heart, which the soul of Christ cannot do : and the spirit of God it was not, because Christ is spoken of in those places, and not the holy Ghost. Nor can it be said that he offered up himself by another spirit that was not his, but by his own spirit ; as it is said, that he entred into heaven not by other bloud which was not his, but by his own bloud, *Heb.* 9. 12. Besides, this offering up of himself through the eternal spirit, is that that is mentioned to put the value upon the offering up of himself to God, above all the legal Sacrifices ; for otherwise,

otherwise, the bloud of a man is no more to God than the bloud of a beast : but the person in reference to this eternal spirit, is more excellent and glorious than all other creatures either men or beasts ; in which regard his flesh is called a greater and more perfect Tabernacle, because this eternal spirit dwelt in it, and filled it with glory. By the bloud of this person he entered in the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

And this is the formal reason and cause whence it came to pass that the sufferings of Christ, which both in soul and body were finite and received an end, for he suffered once, and doth not alwaies suffer ; yet are able to expiate sins which carry infinite guilt in them, being against an infinite God ; and are able to free millions of persons from sufferings ; which are as it were eternal and infinite , because they would not have any end, if Christ by suffering had not discharged from them ; for otherwise it would be utterly impossible that by one sacrifice or offering he should for ever perfect them that are sanctified, but it would have been as when the high Priest offered up daily the same sacrifices, because sin could not be raken away by one sacrifice: but it is this eternal spirit that doth put the worth, and value, and merit into this one sacrifice : therefore it is said that every Priest standeth daily ministering and offering up

the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin ; But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God, expecting from henceforth till his enemies be made his foot-stool : *Heb. 10. 11, 12, 13.* As one that hath done a work that hath great merit, desert, and worth in it expects a reward, looks that things should be so and so done to him ; so Christ after he had offered one sacrifice , sat down , expecting the enemies to be subdued at his feet : which had the offering been of himself a meer man, he could not have done ; for what is man that he should deserve any thing of God ?

Now because the word merit doth relish ill in reference to Christ himself with many , and because all such who are against satisfaction by Christ, or at least against full satisfaction, are much more against merit, because there is no such word found in Scripture, therefore I shall clear up the Doctrine of Christs merit from the Scripture.

1. Scripture testifies that Christ hath made a purchase ; *Acts 20. 28. Feed the flock of God which he hath purchased with his own blood :* this is spoken of Christ, who is called God ; and he is said to purchase the Church with his blood. The Church is called a purchased possession. *Ephes. 1. 14.* The Jews were called a people peculiar by purchase ; so in the Original :

Pet. 2. 9. Salvation is said to be obtained by purchase through our Lord Jésus Christ : *I Thes.* 5. 9. so it is in the Greek. Now this purchase is not an acquisition of grace, as some may conceive, who may give this sense of it : Christ hath gained the Church, and gained or obtained salvation ; but through grace he obtained and gained ; which in an analogical sense may be called a purchase : but this purchase is an acquisition of work, as the Greek word signifies that is used by the holy Ghost, which is *κερπούσιαι* and *κερποίσις*, which signifies to acquire, and get by work ; which is used in *I Tim.* 3. 13. *They that have used the Office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree.* Now he that purchaseth any thing, deserves the thing that he purchaseth ; but Christ hath purchased the Church, hath purchased salvation, hath performed a work that deserves the having of the Church, and the having of salvation for the Church. ; so that if words might not be formally stood upon too much, it is manifest that we have the thing in equivalent expressions.

2. Merit and Desert properly have respect to some work which is not due, neither could be required from such a person ; in which sense Christ may be said to merit, when yet the persons on whose behalf Christ hath done such a work, could not have been said to have merited, if they

in their own persons had done it ; the reason is, because if men having sinned against God, had been able to satisfie the Law to the utmost, in reference to their sin they had committed against it, and had done it, yet they could have merited nothing from God, because such satisfaction was due from them who had so offended, and it would be but the paying of a just debt ; but if an innocent one will come in for another, and this not only out of his respect to the delinquent or offending person, but also to accomplish the will of the offended person, this is not debt, this could not be required ; there is not any Law that requires an innocent one to suffer ; therefore here is desert and merit. Now this is the case in reference to Christs sufferings, they are sufferings of a just one for unjust ones, as the Scripture testifies, *1 Pct. 3. 18.* therefore there is desert and merit in it.

3. There is a Covenant entred into betwixt God and Christ voluntarily on both sides, in which somthing is required and condescended to upon condition ; in which respect it may be said, that Christ having done the works required, deserves the accomplishment of the condition agreed on ; as *Jacob* having served for a wife, might say, Give me the wife which I have served for : which yet cannot be asserted in reference to the Covenant of God with *Adam* ; for though it was of works, yet those works might

might have been required without covenant, and consequently without condition ; and so it was of grace that there was either the one or the other, either covenant or condition ; but works might have been required without any intimation of reward. But Christ is a more excellent person than *Adam* ; he is the Lord from heaven ; a Son, and not a servant, and did voluntarily empty himself, and humble himself, and come in the form of a servant ; *Philip.* 2. 7. therefore God highly exalted him in our flesh, and us in him, and it was compact and covenant, as appears from *Tit.* 1. 2. *God which cannot ly, promised a eternal life before the world was.* To whom was this promise of God made, while as yet the world was not made ? To no creature, because there was no creature ; it was made to Christ, it was the Fathers promise to the Son, it respected a work to be done by Christ, to which work the Father made a promise ; the work was the Redemption of Elect in a way of satisfaction to justice, because of transgression ; and the promise was of eternal life to the Elect so redeemed. *Isa.* 42. 6. *Chap.* 49. 8.

4. There was somthing performed by Christ for the satisfaction of God, which was super-abundant to the transgression of all the Elect, in reference to the dignity and excellency of the Person that performed it, which was not a meer man, as hath been abundantly provyd, but God-man :

man : for as there is no proportion betwixt God offended and man satisfying, so there is no proportion betwixt man sinning, and God satisfying for such sin ; and as in some sense a meaner suffering for sin would have been so far from meriting, that he could not have satisfied, so in a sense it may be said, that such a person as Christ is suffering, not onely satisfyed, but merited in satisfying ; for this one sacrifice of Christ, offering up himself to God in the vertue, efficacy, value, and force of it, might have extended to have purged away the sins of millions more transgressors, if God had pleased, and if they had belenged to the Election of Grace.

5. God had satisfaction which was full and compleat, and perfect in Christ, and which was given at once for the sins of all the Elect, which without Christ could not have been had no not by the sufferings of the persons that had sinned, though God should have laid upon them as much punishment as they could be able to bear; yet because the guilt is infinite, and the creature finite, the creature might have been ever suffering and never satisfying : Now it is an advantage to the Crediter to receive full payment, and to have it at once ; and it is a disadvantage to receive it in parcels, and never to receive all. But transgressors, if the debt ly upon them, will be ever paying, but never all paid ; will

Will be ever suffering, but never satisfying by what is suffered, but still God is a loser when ever the account is cast up : But in Christs undertaking, because he paid God all, therefore God hath advantage by Christs interposition and suretyship which Christ hath undergone, in which respect it may be said that Christ hath merited and deserved.

6. The death of Christ is not only of virtue and of value for the redemption of transgressors from death and destruction in a way of satisfaction, but it also obtains an eternal inheritance for such persons who are so redeemed ; and this comes from the super-abundance of worth and value in Christs death ; that after satisfaction even to God by it, there remains yet somthing of virtue and efficacy in it, to deserve some further favor and grace for transgressors, then barely to free them and deliver them ; viz. to procure and obtain for them eternal inheritance, *Heb. 9. 15.* and all this comes to pass from the transcendent glory and majesty of the person who dyed and rose again ; Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself to God, and so effected not only eternal Redemption, but eternal Inheritance for us, because his Sacrifice who thus offered himself, was infinite in value.

But he argues against an infinite sacrifice thus,
If the sufferings of Christ had been infinite,
there had been no end of them.

Repl.

Rep. The sufferings of Christ were not infinite, materially considered, neither in the quality of them, nor in the duration and continuance of them ; but in reference to the subject person who underwent them, who was God manifest in flesh; The Word made flesh, who dwelt among us, and was put to death among us, and in suffering offered a sacrifice in value infinite.

He further faith,

If the Curse had been infinite, man could not have born it, being incapable of any thing infinite in the infinity of it.

Rep. It is true that man cannot bear it, as not being capable to bear any thing that is infinite, therefore he is ever bearing as he is capable, and yet must ever bear without an end ; because he cannot bear it at once ; and so it comes to pass that he suffers that which is in some sense infinite ; not in the greatness, but in the continuance ; that, which though it be not beyond measure, yet is beyond end. But Christ being not only great in strength, but greater in worth, suffered that which as from him had infinite worth in it.

He thus concludes,

It is enough for me to believe that my Lord Jesus suffered for me whatever I deserved to suffer; and was the curse of the Law, be that what it will.

Rep.

Repl. It is a fearful thing to consider both of the blindness and presumptuousness of men, that even they which deny Christ, and in some sense despitefully use him, will yet lay claim to him ; but let all such know, that he that denyeth the Son, denyeth the Father also ; and such without repentance can have no mercy.

As for that general knowledge which he comforts himself in, it is a seeing a far off, and is next to blindness ; it is like the light of him that saw men like trees walking, there's more darkness in it than light. The mysterie of Christ is not seen in it ; it warms not, heats not, quickens not the heart in love, nor by it are persons able to know what it is they stumble at. It is the knowledge of those that care not what they know ; who behold that which appears above ground, but wil not dig for knowledge as for silver : Such who rest themselves contented with such a knowledge, are never like to know that love of Christ that passeth knowledge. *Eph. 3. 10.*

This is but suitable to some other expressions of his concerning the person of Christ ; to know Christ to be a person sent of God, hath been declared to be sufficient knowledge to save men ; and that text also in *Rom. 10. 9.* is made use of, and this conclusion exserted from it, that to know Christ to be the Lord, whether created or uncreated, whether the same with the Father,

or

or made by the Father, is not material ; a person may be saved without it.

But such assertions are detrimental to godliness, serve to nourish up ignorance of God and Christ, and the mysterie of the Gospel in carnal persons, who have been wont to say, what need is there of so much knowledge ? to know my self a sinner, and that Christ dyed for me, is enough ; and Christ rebukes it, and makes the Scribes and Pharisees ashamed of it, when he asks them whose son Christ was ; and when they said *David's* ; he demands how it could be , when *David* in spirit called him Lord ? but they were confounded and were not able to answer him. Their general knowledge that Christ was *David's* son, without a right perception of his Divinity , in which respect he was *David's* Lord, was no better then shameful ignorance , (seeing God had revealed both the one and the other) both in them and us.

In the close of his answer he deals with a Scripture which I produced to prove that the satisfaction and merit that was in Christ's blood, was from the subject person whose blood it was ; it is called *the blood of God*, *Acts 20. 28*. And indeed he deals injuriously with it, and evilly intreats it. His words are these.

I shall offer these few things to consideration.
There

There may be some mistake in it , God may be put for Christ or Lord, and then the words must be thus read ; *to feed the Church of Christ which he hath purchased with his own blood.*

And why may there be a mistake ? Because (saith he) the Churches of the Saints are called the Churches of Christ, *Rom. 16. 16.* and there is possibility, probability, and facility to countenance it.

Repl. 1. Logicians have been wont to say, *a posse ad esse non valet consequentia* : that the deduction, inference, or consequence that is drawn from [a may be] to [a being so] is weak , and very invalid. There may be a mistake (saith he) and must therefore be a mistake say I ? What good consequence can be in this ? *2.* This Doctrine of mistakes in Scripture , especially in points of such grand concernment , is dangerous to be broached ; it tends greatly to engender Atheisme in the hearts of men, and serves to no better a purpose then to unsettle men in the Faith ; for what will be the consequent of it , if there be mistakes in some things contained in Scripture , why not in other things ? and then what will remain firm that may be surely built upon ? And may not any Heretick when he is

is driven out, and forced to forsake all other holds, fly hither, and shelter himself here, there may be a mistake in the Text or Texts that are cited ? 3. If there were no other place of Scripture wherein Christ were called God, and if there were no place that holds analogy with this of the *Acts*, where the bloud of Christ is called the bloud of God, there might then be better plea for a mistake, which yet would be of evil consequence if it were granted ; but there is a cloud of witnessles that come in to evidence Christs God-head, and there are parallel places to this Text that speaks of the bloud of God : *1 Cor. 2. 8. Had they known him, they would never have crucified the Lord of Glory.* Christ was crucified as he was man, and shed his bloud as he was man, and he was not crucified as he was the Lord of Glory, nor did he shed his bloud as he was God ; and yet it is said, the Lord of Glory was crucified, and the bloud of God was shed : The meaning is, the Person who was Lord of Glory, and who was God, was crucified, and shed his bloud ; but not as he was Lord of Glory, nor as he was God, but flesh was assumed, the humanity was taken, and in that nature he was crucified, and shed his bloud.

But let it be weighed what he faith of the possibility. The Scribe (faith he) through carelessness, or somthing worse, might here put God for

for Christ. There are two places, one in the old Testament, another in the new, which *Will let* conceiveth to have been mistaken by the Scribes negligence, or somthing worse.

Repl. What Scribe doth he here speak of who might be thus negligent, or somthing worse? Doth he mean such Scribes as the holy men of God, who were inspired by the holy Ghost, made use of to write what was suggested and dictated to them by the Spirit? Then those holy Men, Prophets, or Apostles, whether ever they were, who no question had the supervising and perusing of it after written, would have discovered it, and corrected it. Doth he speak of any other Scribes who might afterwards write out Copies of such things? The Original writing would have been extant to have detected and confuted such mistakes, and fraud, and falsehood, and there would have been godly ones enough in those Ages, to have rectified out of the Original such error or deceit. Can any Printer now by any craft or cunning bring corruption into any Text of Scripture but it would soon be discerned? Nor could any Scribe then,

But he gives instances in *Psal. 22. 16.* CAARI signifying *as a Lyon*, is put for CARU, *they pierced*: and in *Rom. 12. 11.* we have *zaios pro neis, time for Lord.*

Repl. He that can search out these things, and make use of them to serve his own turn, whose

faith soever he stumble thereby, might also have presented such answers as are given by the Learned unto them, for no question he hath read them, and if he would have dealt candidly, he would as well have produced the one as the other. I shall only recite something of that which I have read in *Rivet* concerning the one Text, who writes upon it, and shall refer the Learned to satisfie themselves in reading him at large.

This Lection (saith he) *of CAARI as a Lyon,* the latter Jews have snatched at, lest they should be forced to confess that this Prophet,
 [They pierced my hands and my feet] was fulfilled in none other but in Jesus Christ alone; because neither David (who compiled this Psalm) nor any other, had their hands and their feet pierced. But *Joannes Isaacus* hath most learnedly shewed in his defence of the Hebrew verity against *Lindanus*, that nothing is more absurd and foolish than such a Lection or Reading. 1. Because it is pointed contrary to the Rules of Grammar if the signification should be [*as a Lyon*] 2. Because the expression would be strained, and defective, and without sense; for what reason is in these words [*as a Lyon my hands and my feet*] ? 3. He produceth the Authority both of *Massoreth* the great, and the less. In *Massoreth* the less two CAARI are found, and only two in a diverse signification; the one in *Isa. 38. 13.* which is right interpreted,

[as

[as a Lyon] the other in this Psalm, viz. 22. which he quotes, which must necessarily have an other interpretation, because of some peculiarity that is in it. In *Masseleh* the great he saith, that *Rabbi Jacob* found written in the Text CARU, and in the margin CAARI. 4. He speaks his own knowledge, I *Johannes Isaac* can testify in truth, and with a good conscience the same thing for I saw a Psalter of my Grandfathers in which in the Text it was written CARU, and I doubt not but all exemplars had it also.

And *Rivet* adds this, that in all the Hebrew Copies or Exemplars, there is both CAARI and CARU, the one in margin, and the other in the Text: Not that CAARI whether in the margin or in the Text is to be read [as a Lyon] but it is *vox animala*, a word beside rule, and is the third person of the preterperfect tense CARA, by some interposition and change of letters, as is sometimes found in the Hebrew; And he giveth instances of the like.

As for the other Text in *Rom.* 12. 11. I shall refer the Learned to that which *Beza* faith of it, and only exert somwhat for the satisfaction of others.

In all the most approved Authors (faith he) it is κυείω, and καίρω; And he shewes how it is probable the corruption came in, and how κυείω was changed into καίρω. In that short way

of writing (saith he) there is $\kappa\omega$ put for $\kappa\nu\epsilon\iota\omega$; and he saith he hath seen it so written in *Pasil*, and some that writ out, declared this particle $\kappa\omega$ by the word $\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\omega$ instead of $\kappa\nu\epsilon\iota\omega$. And this might easily be done through ignorance of that short hand that was in use.

But it may be observed how ready he is to give advantage to the pertinacious Jews, in siding with them in the rendering of the word **CAARI** [*as a Lyon*] without any warrantable cause for the upholding of his own opinion. And he also takes part with the Papists, who from the various lection, do take occasion of detracting from the truth of the Hebrew and Greek Text, as that which is corrupted by the Jews and others, and would bring all to the interpretation of the Church.

But he goes on, and not onely makes it possible, but probable that there is such a mistake; for (saith he) *Gretius observes many Copies have Lord, and the Syriack hath Christ, not God.*

Repl. Some Copies have *Lord* and *God*; and *Beza* makes a conjecture how it came about; but there is no Copie that hath *Lord* without *God*: *God* is not left out in any Greek Copie, and consequently it makes nothing for his purpose, but remains as strong against him as before: for if the words be read thus, *To feed the Church of the Lord and God, which he hath purchased with his own blood*; the word [which] refers

refers to both of them as Antecedents ; and the meaning is, *which Lord, and which God hath purchased with his own bloud* : and Christ is still set forth as God, and the bloud of Christ is still the bloud of God : But yet his fraud appears, for he saith, *Many Copies have Lord, seperatim & divisim* (for so he would be understood) as if they had had *Lord*, and not *God*, or *Lord* instead of *God* , when as in truth they have them *conjunctionem*, both *Lord* and *God*, conjoyned as Titles of one and the same person, who shed his bloud to purchase his Church. As for the word *Christ* instead of *God*, it is not to be found in any Greek Copie, in which language the New Testament was written, and if in any other, it makes nothing to his purpose.

Lastly (he saith) *It is easie to mistake, taking one for the other, from that compendious writing which was anciently much in use ; where for Jes they wrote only Ιησ, and for Χεισ Χεισ.*

Repl. The mistake of a letter, though it may be easie, yet it may be gross enough, and may utterly overthrow the sense of the place ; and it is as easily discovered, when it is surveyed by him that compiled it : Would it not be gross in our English if *Word* should be written instead of *Lord* ? If *Moon* should be written instead of *Neon* ? and it is but the mistake of a Letter, and it is easily done, and as easily seen being done, and corrected; therefore this Argument is without force also.

To make this conceit of his of a mistake to pass the better, he saith *the Churches of Saints are called the Churches of Christ*, Rom. 16. 16.

— *Repl.* And what is this to the purpose? they are called *the Churches of God* also, 1 Cor. 11. 16. And they are never a whit the less the Churches of God, because they be the Churches of Christ; yea because they be the Churches of Christ, they be therefore the Churches of God; and this Text proves it: For Christ is the person that is here spoken of, because the person that shed his bloud for the purchase of the Church is spoken of, which is Christ, and he is called God, and as God, the Church is his; as the words declare, which he hath not yet overthrown.

But he attempts it by an other consideration which he offers to view:

2. *If it proves that there is no mistake in the Text* (saith he) *there may be a defect in the words*; for the last clause some Greek Copies have it thus; which he hath purchased with the bloud of his Own, and so the Word SON is to be understood; with the bloud of his own Son.

Repl. It is said of some persons who are loth to work, that they live by their shifts, or by their wits; so this man, who is loth to be convinced of the Truth, will maintain and keep alive an error (if he can) by his wits, or by his shifts, which are more than one; and when one fails

fails him, he flies to an other ; yet all that he
 says is but *may be*] which we have been troubled
 enough with already : He doth not say there is
 a defect in the words, but *it may be there is*,
 which we know proves nothing. Yet I shall
 pass over his [*may be*] in silence, but say something
 to that which he bottoms it upon ; he saith,
*Some Greek Copies read it thus, which he hath
 purchased with the bloud of his own, meaning*
 [Son :] but Beza saith it is one Copie that the
 words run so in ; whether shall I believe (for I
 have not seen all the Greek Copies my self,
 though I have examined some) Beza or him ?
 When he comes up to Beza's learning and integ-
 rity, I shall be at a stand whose testimony to
 take, but not till then. However this will do
 him no good ; for the bloud is the price where-
 with the purchase was made ; and it was his
 bloud that made it, for it was not made with an
 others bloud ; but the Text is clear, and he can-
 not overthrow it, that the person that purchased
 it is God ; then the bloud must needs be the
 bloud of God also, because therewith he pur-
 chased : So that if there be one Copie that saith
which he purchased with the bloud of his own,
 yet the defect will be in the word *self* that is
 wanting, and not in the word *Son* that is want-
 ing ; and the words must run thus ; *which he
 purchased with the bloud of his own self.* And
 if it were as he would have it, *with the bloud of*

his own Son, yet it is a proper Son that is spoken of; and the Apostle makes him God in that expression: As the Jews said of Christ, that he made himself equal with God, because he said, God was his own proper Father, as the words are in the Original, John 5.18. and this amounts to as much as I intended in the quotation of the place; this puts value and merit enough upon the satisfaction of Christ, that it was the blood of a person that was God and equal with the Father, that was shed for the taking away of sin.

But he hath a third evasion, and if he be beaten out from the covert of that, whither will he then fly?

3. If both these be removed, saith he, yet the words may have an other meaning then what you and many others do allot them; Christ's blood may be said to be Gods own blood in way of eminency, it being more excellent by far then the blood of the Legal Sacrifice's. In the old Testament, tall Trees are called the Cedars of God; in this sense also Christ is called the Lamb of God, John 1.36. because he was far more excellent then either the paschal Lamb or any other Lamb which was to be slain in way of Sacrifice: And the Author to the Hebrews in this sense prefers the blood of Christ far before all other blood shed for the expiation of sin, Heb.9.13,14.

Repl. If he could but turn the word [may] into the word [must] and could be able to make

it out from the text or context, that the sense that he puts upon the words must be the true sense of the place, and that none other that any other allots to it can stand or consist with it, there would be some weight in his words ; but this [may be] hath nothing but weakness and uncertainty in it.

2. The sense that he puts upon the text, is without sense, there is not the least footing for it in the Text ; it is a mere invention, without the shadow of reason in it, for that which it is grounded on, is not to be found in the Text ; there is no mention of the bloud of God in the Text, and therefore no reason he should parallel it with such like phrases as the Trees of God, the Cedars of God, which are of the same nature with other trees, but are more excellent, and are therefore called the Trees and Cedars of God. The words in the Greek are διὰ τὸ ιδίον αἷμα, which Beza renders *suo illo proprio sanguine*, that is, by that his own proper bloud ; and it relates to the subject spoken of before, which is God ; for the exhortation is, *to feed the Church of God*, and it is addēd, *which he*, that is, which God *hath purchased with his own proper bloud*; so that it is the bloud of God through the relation it hath to a person, that is called God, whose bloud it is, and not by way of excellency, as trees are called the trees of God, for the excellency they have in them aboye other trees,

trees, which yet stand in no relation to God, Now if he be able to prove that God is not here spoken of, but it is another that is not God, though he be called God ; then may he prove that the bloud that is said to be his bloud, is yet not the bloud of the person that is God, but the bloud of another that is called God, but is not God; otherwise it stands in force : the bloud of Christ is not the bloud of a meer creature, but the bloud of God ; whence the merit of it proceeds for the expiating of sin.

Whereas he saith that in this sense *Christ is called the Lamb of God, because he was far more excellent then the Paschat Lamb, or any other Lamb that was sacrificed.* It is granted that he was so called for that reason, and not only because Christ who was slain was man, and those Lambs were but bruit creatures, and so inferior to him, but because the person of this Lamb slain, was more then a man, was the Son of God, and very God : but not slain like a Lamb as he was the Son of God, and very God, but according to the humanity which he assumed; and as the son of man, and very man, so was he slain. It is said, *the son of man must be delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him :* yet though he could not suffer as God, he notwithstanding by the eternal Spirit, viz. by the Divinity or God-head, offered up himself a sacrifice a Lamb without spot and blemish to God;

God ; which made his bloud more effectual to expiate sin, then the blood of Goats could be ; for otherwise there would have been no difference in point of worth and value, in purging away of sins of men ; for the bloud of a man at the most, could but satisfie for the offence of a man, and not of many men ; and to this purpose the bloud of a man would have been as ineffectual as the bloud of a beast.

I have been large in the vindication of this instance, because the matter of it was weighty, it being a great Truth of God, and of high concernment to the Saints : I shall be the briefer in the next.

The ninth Argument or Instance that I produced, was this,

Inst. 9. If Christ be a meer creature, then the Intercession of Christ is overthrown ; for Christ if a meer man being in heaven, cannot know the state of the Church in all places upon earth, therefore cannot intercede for it.

He reduceth this into the form of an Argument to little purpose but to fill up paper, after this manner.

That Doctrine which utterly overthrows the Intercession of Christ, brings in as it were another Gospel ;

But the Doctrine that makes Christ a meer creature, utterly overthrows the Intercession of Christ, Therefore

He grants the *Major* proposition, but denies the *minor*, and complaies for want of proof, in these words.

What? Must we again take your word for a proof? I wish a better, for there is no goodness in that; we have been too long troubled with the word (I say) instead of proof, &c.

Repl. This answer is much altered, it hath fallen under correction since it was first ptesented to me in the manuscript; there was profane scurrility in it; wherein he shewed the tincture of his spirit: but I complained to one of his dear friends, who was too highly conceited of him, who gave him an Item of it, and so the words came to be changed, though there be harshness enough without any just cause for it. His expressions did run thus.

*We have already been troubled enough with the Prophet I say: Wherein he first breaks his rest upon me. 2. He doth it in a profane way, abusing that Evangelical Prophet *Isaiah*, which abbreviated is written *I say*, whose person and name deserve reverence, because the honour of becoming the Pen-man of the holy Ghost was put upon him. Nor was there occasion given him to sport thus with the Prophets name, for I know not that any such words can be found in my writing, as [I say] no nor yet the sense of them; for I have not nakedly delivered any thing but there hath been either Scripture or*

Argument

Argument to inforce it; and in this very instance,
 i.e. *viz. If Christ be a meer creature, then the inter-*
 in *cession of Christ is overthrown*; there is a reason
 to inforce it, which was thus; *Because a meer*
 a *man being in heaven, could not know the state of*
 e *the Churches in all places upon earth, and therefore*
 he *could not intercede according to the condi-*
 th *tion and necessity of the Churches*: And though
 ed *this reason was not confirmed with another,*
 ne *(which it seemes he expected it should have bin)*
 is *yet it was not because there was no good reason*
 of *to be rendred, but because I was in great straits*
 e *of time when I thought of, and wrote out that*
 . *paper of Scripture and Arguments, and had not*
 b *liberty to enlarge upon any thing, having not*
 s *three hours to consider of the thing; and be-*
 e *cause I intended them to fall under the considera-*
 p *tion of more candid persons; and because I*
 a *thought what I presented, might easily be main-*
 tained from Scripture, if there should be any
 contest.

Nor hath he invalidated the proof I brought
 for the strengthning of this Argument, notwithstanding his complaint of want of proof. Let it
 be considered what he saith.

What (saith he) have you learned to mea-
sure the knowledge of him who hath received
the spirit without measure? Cannot he as man
know in heaven what things are done on earth?
Who told you so?

Repl.

Repl. These are strange expressions to proceed from one that denies the Deity of the Spirit equally, as he doth the Deity of Christ; and who makes both the Son, and the holy Ghost finite creatures; and who makes the Son the first and principall of all the creatures, and the Lord of all the rest, yea God (in some sense) to them all; and so the spirit himself is servant unto Christ, and Christ is his Lord, and in a kind his God.

The contradictions in this expostulation of his, *What? have you learned to measure the knowledge of him who hath received the spirit without measure?* in reference to the forementioned Tenents of his, are not a few.

His expressions seem to me to carry such a sense; 1. That Christs knowledge is so great that it is unmeasurable, and consequently infinite; and yet he himself but a creature; and consequently finite, which is a contradiction. 2. That this knowledge of Christ came to be unmeasurable, because the spirit was given to him without measure, and yet the spirit himself is finite, and consequently measurable according to him. And if the spirit were infinite, and his wisdom infinite, (as indeed he is though he denye it) yet if Christ be a mere creature and wholly finite, as he holds, the maxime is infallible, that, *quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis*; *What ever thing is received is*

is received according to the Capacity of that which doth receive it ; and consequently, when Christ who receives the Spirit is finite, he is not capable to receive any proportion of the spirit but what is finite, and he may be measured; though the spirit were infinite. And so there is a double contradiction. 3. That this excellent knowledge of Christ, which he saith cannot be measured, was received by his receiving of the spirit; and yet Christ is greater, and more excellent than this spirit, and the Creator of him, and Lord and God unto him, which is an other contradiction.

Obj. But he may plead for himself, and say, that his words are wrested; and that he demands of me, whether I have learned to measure the knowledge of him, &c ?

Sol. Though I am not able to measure the knowledge of Christ (who received the Spirit) positively, so as to declare exactly what measure he received, and no more; yet I am able to measure the knowledge of Christ (which he had by the donation of the Spirit) negatively; I can say it was not unmeasurable, it was not infinite.

But he bottoins this interrogation upon a Scripture, viz. John 3. 34. where he saith, that *God giveth not his Spirit by measure to him*; And he interprets it to be without measure, and by consequence infinitely.

But he is mistaken, for there is a comparison
betwixt

betwixt Christ and *John* the Baptist, and other Ministers of the Church, for they received the Spirit, and are limitted and stinted, and receive not all that they are capable of, and must have, but the Spirit is divided to them as it pleaseth God ; to one man is given Wisdom, and to an other Knowledge, &c. *1 Cor.* 12. 11. and *Eph.* 4. 7. and *Rom.* 12. 3. but to Christ is given the Spirit, not by measure, that is, not according to this measure ; for Christ hath all these, and he hath the Spirit in perfection, and not imperfectly, as men here have ; and he hath the whole as he is capable of, as man, but yet the whole is not infinite nor unmeasurable : of which I have largely before spoken, and therefore shall not inlarge here.

It may be further said by way of negation, that all the knowledge that Christ hath received as man by the donation of the Spirit, doth not enable him as man, and being in heaven, to know the state of all Saints in all places on earth, unless it be by revelation from God immediately, and anew every moment : The reason is, because as Christs body is confined to heaven, so his soul is confined to his body, and so the whole humane nature of Christ is confined to one place, and is not, neither can be present with one saint on earth, much less with all saints on earth ; and without this presence, there can be no knowledge ; for Gods infinite knowledge

is by his infinite presence; but this hath also been spoken of before. And because none can know the state of saints but he that can know the heart of saints, but no creature doth this but he that made the heart, and gave to man knowledge, as the Scripture speaks, *Psal. 94. 8, 9, 10.* and this is God alone.

But he goeth on, and saith ;

None but the man Christ Jesus can intercede, it being absurd to conceive that God can intercede, unless it might be conceived that God hath a superior : Now if the man Christ Jesus doth intercede for his Church, he knows her state; and why he may not know it by a communication of power from the Father, notwithstanding he be not God and man in one person, is a riddle ; for the unfolding whereof I would willingly plow with your heifer:

Repl. The act of Intercession doth belong to Jesus Christ as man, and the reason is strong which he renders ; but the ability to intercede, seeing it must be for all saints, according to their particular conditions and necessities, doth appertain to Christ as God, and the validity of his intercession is bottomed there also.

And whereas he speaks of a communication of power from the Father, to know the state of the Church ; if he mean by it any inherent power or virtue residing in Christ, but given by the Father, by which Christ is enabled by him-

self from time to time, to know all the hidden things, and deepest secrets, and the most inward thoughts and ways, and the most retired temptations and spiritual necessities of the Church it is impossible, for the reasons before mentioned ; and because there is not a greater thing by which the excellency and glory of that infinite wisdom of God himself can be discovered and made known then this, to penetrate the hearts, and discern the motions of the spirits of men ; and because the Lord himself by the Prophet *Amos*, reckons this, *viz.* *the declaring unto man his thought*, among the great, and proper, and peculiar works of God, which the creature cannot effect, whch require an infinite power, which no creature can be the subject of ; in *Amos* 4.13. *For lo he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man his thought*, &c. and then he concludes, *the Lord, the God of hoast is his Name*. And because both God himself, and the Prophets, and holy men of God have attributed it to God alone, as hath bin proved before, and you may discern from *Dan.* 2. 11. that it is imprinted upon the very spirits and minds of the Heathen, to acknowledge a peculiarity in this thing to appertain to God. And because its poslible a like for the Father to communicate to the creature a power of being every where, as of knowing all things in all places, yea the most insearachable things of all persons without

out any personal presence, where such persons and things are : And indeed it may as rationally and as truly be asserted, that God may communicate his own nature and essence, and all his attributes to the creature, as communicate this attribute of omniscience, or invest man with a power of knowing of the state of all saints, which is all one ; for what is it that God cannot give a power to know, if he can give power to know the inclinations, hidden motions, secret workings, and abstruse actings of the soul and spirit ? and if God can make the creature to know as much as himself knows, by communication, then he can make the creature a God by communication. And if we look into the way by which God himself comes to know these things , we shall be able to discern that this knowledge cannot be communicated, because all things and persons are of God, and from God, and they live, move, and have their being in him, therefore it is impossible but that he should be acquainted with all their actings, motions, and ways ; but this is incomunicable which is the cause of this knowledge of God. God cannot make persons or things to have their subsistings and motions in the creature, and therefore he cannot communicate such a power, and make it reside in the creature, by which they may have such a knowledge. The effect is no more communicable than the cause is communicable.

But if he meaneth by a communication of power from the Father to know the state of the Church, nothing else but Gods revealing to Christ in heaven from time to time, the state and condition of the Church, and of all saints, as he did to *Daniel Nebuchadnezzars Dream* which was gone from him ; this will be granted as possible in reference to the creature, but this is not properly a communication of power to the creature from the Father ; but the manifestation of Gods Wisdom and Power by the creature, and the creature is not the subject of it in which this wisdom resides, but God himself. But this is not suitable to Christ, to say that what knowledge Christ hath in heaven of the affairs of the Church, and state of the saints, is by Gods revelation ; for this would make Christ a Priest of like imperfection which was in the high Priests, for they were capable of revelation also as well as Christ, if God had pleased to have manifested himself unto them in the discovery of the Churches wants ; but it behoved Christ to be more excellent, to be a Priest not in weakness, but in strength, and to be able to save to the utmost, and consequently to have the ability of interceding in himself. For to be able to save by another's strength, is such an ability as *Paul* speaks of, when he saith, *I am able to do all things through Christ strengthening of me* : such ability is inability, it is to be unable rather then able in
and

and of himself ; as a child that is moved by the strength of the arms of the Mother, or as a sick man that is upheld in his walking; which makes nothing to the glory of Christ at all, but is a dis-honor to him: and hence it is that it was needful that Christ should be God and man in one per-son, that he might be the subject of this power, and that he might by himself save us. Besides, it is unscriptural to say that the Father reveals the state of the Church to Christ, and that Christ knows it not till then. Yea, it is repugnant to the Scripture, for it is said Christ is *he that searcheth the heart, &c.* he knows, because he searcheth, and not because it is revealed to him.

But he passeth from this ninth Argument, under pretence to visit my tenth, and yet faith never a word to it, but refers me to his answer to Matth. 28. 20. *I am with you alwaies to the end of the world.* But whether this be solidly or slightly done, I shall leave to the Reader to judge after I have presented it to his view.

The tenth Argument or Instance was this ;

Inst. 10. *If Christ be a meer creature, then how can he protect, and defend, and save, and direct, and rule, and govern his Church in all the world, in every condition, and against all enemies, he being at such a distance and remoteness from the Church ? and yet it is said of him, that he is able to save to the utmost those that come to God by him, Heb. 1. 25. and that he is with them to the*

end of the world. And Christ stood by Paul and strengthned him in suffering, Acts 23. 11. And Christ saith Rev. 3. 10. Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I will also keep thee from the hour of Temptation. So that it is Christ now in heaven, that keeps the saints on earth, which being a meer creature he cannot do.

The Reader may easily observe that the force of this Instance lies in two particulars especially; 1. If he be a meer creature, how will he be able, how can he have power to perform such acts as those are that are mentioned; conducing to the safety and welfare of his Church, having such enemies to conflict with, and such evils to save from? 2. How can he do it at such distance? How can he do it he being in heaven, and they being on earth? What vertue is that that is in Christ as meer man, that reacheth the Saints in all places, and is sufficient to preserve, and keep, and rule, and govern them? He may also cast his eye upon the Scriptures which I quote; of which *Matth. 28. 20.* is but one, to which he refers me; and the rest he passeth over in silence, as if they were all of them answered in his answer to *Matth. 28. 20.* but let his answer to that text be surveyed, and it will appear to be otherwise; I shall re-mind the Reader of the sum of it.

These works of instructing, comforting, strengthening, he doth in his absence by his Spi-

rit, whom the Father hath sent in his Name; for the Spirit which came in Christ's name, was the instrument by which Jesus Christ did the work.

Doth this answer of his satisfie in reference to that Text in *Heb. 7. 2.* *He is able to save to the utmost those that come to God by him?* Is this the meaning of it, he is not able by himself to save to the utmost, but by the Spirit, who is his Instrument he is able? If it be, then Christ alone is not a sufficient Saviour, but Christ and the Spirit together; or rather, Christ is insufficient, but the Spirit is sufficient, and yet but a creature, and inferiour to Christ, and his Instrument. But the Apostles designe is to set out, not the Spirits sufficiency, but Christ's sufficiency. Much les is satisfaction given by this answer of his to *Acts 22. 11.* where it is said, that *the Lord stood by Paul, and said, be of good cheer Paul, for as thou hast testified of me at Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness of me at Rome.* Suppose this were done in a Vision, yet the Vision is of Christ, not of the Spirit, I have not said that the Spirit stood by the Lord, and it is the presence of Christ himself, and the consolation of Christ himself that *Paul* in this Vision is instructed of, though neither the Father nor the holy Ghost is to be excluded; for Father, Son, and holy Ghost are all of them present with all saints alwaies, and do all of them work the same work, the order still observed: So that when it

is said that the Father and the Son do instruct or protect by the Spirit, it must not be understood that they are *causa adjuvantes*, causes helping one another ; for all of them are all-sufficient, and all of them do effect the whole work in such an order of working : much less that the Spirit is only operative, and the Father and Son are inactive in the work, and are onely authorative in it, and do employ the Spirit as their instrument ; as the lord of the house doth act things by his servants, whom he employs as messengers to effect such things, or whom he appoints or designs for such undertakings ; for so would he have us to conceive of Christ, that he doth nothing himself, but is contained in heaven, and is neither present, nor acts any thing on earth, but sends the Spirit to effect all for him, and this Spirit is present, and doth all that is done, and Christ himself doth nothing : For this is confuted in this Vision, where the Lord sheweth himself present, and he himself gives out the word of *good cheer*, and effects it also by his own power.

The next Instance or Argument in order which he gives answer to, I shall pass over, reserving it to the last place, and shall vindicate the Instance that follows, as is last in the paper, from that unkind dealing which it meets with from him. The Argument is this.

Inst. 11. If Christ be a meer creature, then Prayer to him (being now in heaven) is altogether vain and frivolous, in as much as persons may cry aloud long enough before Christ hear them at that distance; but the Saints have bin wont not onely to pray to God in Christ's name, but to pray to Christ directly and immediately; in Acts 7. 57. Rev. 22. 20. Lord Jesus receive my spirit. Come Lord Jesus.

His answer is,

By the rule of the Gospel we are to pray to God, or the Father, in the name of Christ Jesus; you have nothing to countenance prayer to Christ but the two Texts you mention: If Stephen did pray directly to Jesus Christ, his act might be warranted by the visible appearance of Jesus Christ, as Lot prayed to the Angel being visible. That in Revelation is no prayer, but an intimation of the Churches desire after Christ's coming: the like manner of speaking we have Rev. 6. 16. which is no prayer.

Repl. Here is a bundle of conclusions, and monstrous untruths packed up together. 1. He saith, By the rule of the Gospel we are to pray to God, or the Father, in the name of Jesus Christ, which being taken exclusively (as he must needs understand it, else he speaks at randome, and not to the thing) viz. that prayer to Christ is against the rule of the Gospel, is very false; and herein he condemns the generation of Gods children, and

Stephen

Stephen more especially, who prayed to God the Son ; for every Text of Scripture that enjoyns prayer to God, enjoyns it to the whole Trinity, to Father, Son, and Spirit, and not to the Father only ; because there is no God but he, who is one in Essence, and three in persons , as hath been proved before. And let him shew that rule that enjoyns prayer to God, *viz.* the Father, excluding the Son and the holy Ghost, if he can ; and if he cannot, let him blush for shame because he hath asserted it ; and he hath offended here against the generation of the saints, who have been wont to pray to God in the person of the Son, not excluding the Father and the Spirit. *Stephen* is an example of such a practise, and many more besides him ; in *Act. 7. 59.* *They stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit.* It was the second person, the Son who took flesh, and is God in flesh, that was called upon, and prayed unto, and must he be made a Transgressor ?

But he saith, *I have nothing to countenance prayer to Christ but these two Texts which I mention, this of Stephen, and that other of John.* But this is as gross an untruth as the former, yea more palpable to all mens eyes then the former, for in *1 Cor. 1. 2.* all saints are described to be such who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus. And the Apostle Paul prayed familiarly to Christ, in *2 Cor. 12. 8, 9.* *For this I besought the*

the Lord ; what Lord was this ? It was the Lord Christ : How may that appear ? From the answer that he received, and the use he made of it ; the answer was, *My grace is sufficient for thee, My power is made perfect in weakness :* the use that he makes of it is this, *most gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.* The power that is made perfect in weakness, is the power of Christ. And in 2 Thes. 2. 16,17. *Now the Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, comfort your hearts, &c.* The Apostle if he pray to the Father, he prays to the Son also, for he joyns them both together, and gives Christ in this place, herein the preheminence, that he mentions Christ before the Father in this prayer.

But he excepts against these two examples of *Stephen* and *John* ; first he makes a question of it, whether *Stephen* did pray directly to Christ or not ; for he expresseth himself with an (*if*) as if he doubted ; but to doubt in plain things is foolishness , and to stumble where there is no stone to stumble at, is perverseness. It will be granted (I hope) that he prayed to him to whom he spake ; but he spake to Christ ; and the words in the Greek make it clear, *They stoned Stephen, calling upon and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit ;* there is none other mentioned but the Lord Jesus upon whom he called, and to whom he said, *receive my spirit ;* and he warrants

warrants it by Christ's visible appearance, as Lot's prayer unto the Angels being visible; but what visible appearance was there when Paul prayed to Christ in the forementioned places? or when all the Saints prayed to Christ, as the Apostle intimates the practise to be in the primitive times? what sight had they first of Christ before they prayed? did Christ appear visibly to every one of them first? what a groundless conceit is this, and how far from truth? besides, what did such a visible sight advantage him, when he saw him in heaven; for unless it were in a vision that he saw him, it was in heaven that he saw him; and if so, the distance was as great as if he had not seen him, therefore it could not be bottomed upon that ground; for Christ was never a whit the more present because Stephen saw him: And so the example of Lot's praying to the Angel is no whit suitable, because the Angel was not only visible, but present.

But what doth he mean by bringing in such an instance of Lot's praying to an Angel? will he set on foot the doctrine of invocation upon saints and Angels by it? If he would do it, that instance which he brings of Lot, will not help, him at all, it was neither of the two Angels that Lot prayed to, that he received into his house and lodged, but the third Angel before whom Abraham stood, who was now come to the other two, and this was Jehovah in

in the person of the Son, who often appeared as an Angel, which appeareth from, *Gen. 19.ver.*
 17. When they had brought them forth abroad, *he said escape for thy life;* that is when the two Angels which came first to *Lot* had brought *Lot*, and his wife and daughters out, *he said,* that is, neither of the two Angels, for they are mentioned joynly all along, and neither of them singled out from the other, but it was the third Angel, or *Jehovah*(as he is called)that appeared now to *Lot*, and this was he to whom he prayed. This appears further from *ver. 22.23.*
 24. *I can do nothing* saith this Angel to whom *Lot* prayed, *till thou come thither* and afterward it is said, *the Lord rained &c.* in the Hebrew *Jehovah rained &c. from Jehovah*, the Son from the Father: It was he that rained fire and brim-stone that said before to *Lot*, in answere to his prayer, *I have accepted thee in this thing; haste thee thither, for I can do nothing till thou come thither:* and this is called *Jehovah*, and it is said *he rained from Jehovah*. So that he is grossly mistaken in this also, about *Lots* praying to a creature Angel, by which he would prove it warrantable to pray to a creature Christ, but puts it upon the visibleness of him, when yet this Angel was not only visible, but present; and *Jehovah* in the person of a man.

He also excepts against *John's* prayer, he saith
it was an intimation of the Churches desire after
Christs

Christ's coming, but no prayers, and he quotes Rev.6.16. as a parallel place where such expressions are used, yet no prayer: But there is a different reason when one speaks, to irrational things, which have no understanding, nor knowledge, and which are not capable of a prayer, and when speach is directed to persons that are capable thereof: had those words been spoken to God, *let the mountains and the hills fall on us,* they would have been an imprecation, which is one kind of prayer. And whereas he saith, *if is but an intimation of desire, and no prayer,* he shewes himself ignorant of the nature of prayer; for what is prayer, but an intimation of the desire of a person, to one that is able to answer him in it. And what are those expressions of the Apostles, in their Epistles to the Churches, but prayers for them & yet they are intimations of the Apostles desires; *Grace be with you, and Peace from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ our Lord. And the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father &c, and Grace be with you, and Peace from him that is, was, and which is to come, and from Jesus Christ &c.* 1 Cor.1.3. 2 Cor.13.14.2 John.2. Rev.1 4,5.

But he goes on and tells me,

I cannot (saith he) but looke on that as vain and frivoles, which you set up as the wals and bulwarkes of your Argument, viz if Christ were

but a meer creature, being in heaven, we might cry loud and long enough before he could hear us.

I would only ask you this question, whether Christ could not hear as far as Stephen could see? Stephen could see from earth to heaven, though he was but a man, what will hinder the man Christ from hearing as far?

Repl. I would also demand of him, and ask a question or two, and if he answer me, he may answer himself. 1. Whether can any man on earth, and whether could Adam in his innocence hear as far as he can see? or whether such a thing be possible in nature? whether the eye be not slower in discerning its object, then the eye in discerning its object? 2. Whether Stephen saw Christ by the strength of his own natural eye sight? if so, why did not all the rest see Christ as well as he? if not, then he was strengthened to see that which he saw, and so it was no less then wonderfull, that he saw Christ; God, by the greatness of his power made Stephen to see Christ; and so it may be granted that God by the exceeding greatness of his power, might enable the man Christ, or Christ according to his manhood to hear Stephen, but then it is a thing above nature, and so it comes to this, that Christ as man is not able but is only capable of being made able, and prayer to Christ is not to be bottomed upon that. 3. Whether it was the voice that Stephen uttered that was the cause of

of Christ's hearing *Stephen?* or whether if there had been no voice, Christ could not have heard the voice of the heart, the motions of it, the cry of it? if Christ could notwithstanding have heard, as is apparent from other Scriptures, then it was not the eare of the body, or the fleshly eare with which Christ heard *Stephen*, but it was by that vast boundless knowledge, which Christ had, as the Son of God, and as God, and by which the disciples told him that *he knew all things*: and then the comparison which he makes betwixt Christ and *Stephen*, the one's seeing, and the other's hearing, might have been spared, for the things are not alike in which the comparison was made. And this shewes the absurdity of his imagination, viz. that the knowledge that Christ hath, being in heaven, of the prayers that are made on earth to him, by the hearing of the eare.

But I shall consider what answers he gives to the last arguement, or instance, which is this.

Inst. 12. If Christ be a meer creature, then a meere creature is the Judge of the world, which is against the scripture for the Judge of the world is God, before whom Abraham stood. Gen. 18.25, when he pleaded for Sodom, Rom. 1.5,6. the day of Judgement is called the day of revelation of the righteous Judgement of God, so who will render to every one according to his works.

(22)

He attemps according to his manner, to put this argument into forme, but foully mistakes himself therein, for it comes mishapen from him, he cannot reduce it to moode and figure; either he was never Master of that Art, and so attempts things out of his Element, or else he hath greatly forgot himself, for it is no Syllogisme as he hath shapen it. I shall first present it to the Reader, and then shew how it ought to have been formed.

That Doctrine which makes a meer creature the Judge of the world, is against the Scripture, *Gen. 18. 15. Rom. 2. 5, 6.*

But Christ is the Judge of the world,
Therefore

That Doctrine that makes Christ a meer creature is against the scripture, Thus he.

That this argument is beside rule, appeares by this; because every regular Syllogisme hath but three terms in it, viz. the *Subject*, the *Predicative*, and the *Medium*, but this Syllogisme of his, hath 4 termes in it.

1. There is the *Subject*, viz. *that Doctrine that makes Christ a meer creature.*

2. There is the *Predicative*, viz. *is against the Scripture.*

3. There is the *Medium*, viz. *that Doctrine which makes a meer creature the judge of the world.*

4. There is an another *terme*, which is more

then regular, viz. *Christ is the Judge of the world.*

Therefore it is plaine that the Sylogisme is false, and it ought to have been thus formed,

That Doctrine which makes a meer creature the judge of the world, is against the Scripture,

But that Doctrine which makes Christ a meer creature, is a Doctrine that makes a meer creature the judge of the world,
Therefore,

That Doctrine that makes Christ a meer creature is against the Scripture.

I thought good to present this error of his to the Readers view, because my paper being never intended for him, was in a plaine facile way penned, that it might be the better conceived of by such to whom I presented it, who understood not rules of disputing; but he puts all into a scholaistique forme, and would not encounter with me in that plain way of arguing, with this designe (as he pretended) to make my weaknes the more obvious, but sure I am whether my weaknes be obvious or not, his over sight (that I say no worse) is obvious in transgressing the rules of arguing, which yet himself chuseth, as pretending to have skill in them.

And whereas he answers to both propositions, his labour might have been spared, in reference to the Minor proposition, which is undoubtedly true,

true, as appears from the syllogisme rightly framed ; for who can deny but that doctrine which makes Christ a meer creature, makes a meer creature judge of the world ?

The Major Proposition can thicrefoare only be denied by him, and indeed he doth deny it. 1. By proposing of examples of creatures who shall judge the world. 2. By distinguishing betwixt the supreme judge of the worrd, and a delegate Judge; and grants the proposition to be true, only in reference to the principal or supreme Judge, but asserts it to be false of the delegate Judge. And this he doth with a great deal of confusion, for I rather represent what he would say, then what he doth say.

First he tells us of the Apostles. *That they shall sit upon twelve Thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of Israel*, Mat. 19. 28. and then he tells us of the saints, that *they shall judge the world*, 1 Cor. 6. 2,3. and then tells me, *that doubtless I had not this text of Corinthis when I brought this Argument in my thoughts.*

Repl. Whether I had this text of the Corinthis in my mind in that very moment when I penned down this Argument, I am not able to say ; but I would not have him to be conceited as if he had brought some new and strange thing to my knowledge, which before I understood not, as his words do import, which are these ; *What will you say if I shall shew you from the Word that*

the Apostles shall be Judges at the last day, and that the Saints shall judg the World ? Alas, alas, that man that shall be non-pluss'd with the shewing of such a thing as this, is but poorly learned in Christianity.

It is easily answered, that though the Apostles and Saints shall judg the world, &c. yet they are no where called the Judges of the World : And their judging is Catacheristically, and very improperly so called. The Apostles more especially are said to judg the twelve Tribes, or the World, because as *Paul speaks, all shall be judged according to their Gospel, Rom. 2. 16.* and both Apostles and Angels do judg the World, as *Afflatores, as Peter Martyr saith, Christus Apostolos & Santos omnes cooptavit afflores ; They sit after the manner of Justices of the Peace upon the Bench, and hear all, and allow of all, and approve of all, and allow of all, and consent to all, and are Witnesses of Christs righteous proceedings, and in no other sence can they be said to judg ; and what hath he gained by this ? and what doth his new discovery, which he thought I never thought of, amount to ?*

His distinction is to better purpose which he brings afterward, of *principal Judg, and Delegate or Deputy Judg ;* and yet it will not mar my Market, as he imagines; his words are.

In a sence it is true, no creature can be Judg but

but God, that is principal in Government, God being both the Alpha and Omega of it, deriving his power from none, being the Original of all power.

And afterward he lays down two Propositions.

1. That the most high God, who is the Worlds principal Judg, will not immediately, but by a Delegate, judg the World, Acts 17.31. John 5.22. 1 Cor.15.28.

2. That Jesus Christ is subordinate Judg, in reference unto God the supream Judg, but superintendent in reference to the Saints, Act.10.42. & 3.20. Mat.16.27. Joh.5.27.

Rep. One distinction which hath been often given, and is ordinary and familiar with Christians, of no vast knowledg, will satisfie the Propositions, and answer all the Scriptures, and reconcile all seeming differences. The most high God, who as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in each person, is the Worlds principal Judg, and every person not excluding the other is so. And Christ, as he is the second Person in the God-head, as he is the Son, and as he is equal with the Father, is the Worlds principal Judg, considered apart from the flesh, which he hath now assumed, the Father and the Holy Ghost not excluded. And this I prove from Scripture, Gen. 18.26. The Person before whom Abraham stood was Christ, the second Person in the Tri-

nity, not incarnate at that time ; and he is called *Jehovah*, and *Abraham* calls him *the Judg of all the Earth* : And in *Gen. 19. 24.* he acted as a Judg ; he *Jehovah* the Son, rained fire and brimstone upon *Sodom* from *Jehovah* his Father. And in *Isai. 45. 22, 23.* Christ calls himself *God*, and faith, *there is none else* ; and faith, that *every knee shall bow to him*, that is, in the day of Judgment, as the Apostle (an Expositor without exception) holds forth in *Rom. 14. 10, 11.* But Christ as considered in flesh, being found in fashion as a man, as he is Mediator betwixt God and man, being both God and man in one Person, is designed and ordained by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to judg the world in righteousness, as from *Act. 17. 31.* he proves, *And so the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost judg no man, but have committed all Judgment to the Son in flesh, Job. 5. 22.* and in the Son in flesh they judg, and this Power and Honour hath he received as Mediator in flesh ; but when all enemies are subdued and judged, then he shall deliver up this Kingdom and Power, and Glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the one true God, who shall be all in all, and the Son himself according to the flesh shall be subject. And in this sense as Mediator in flesh, he may be called a delegate Judg ; for that the humane Nature of Christ should be taken up into the fellowship of this Glory with the eternal Son, this was by ordi-

ordination. As the Son in flesh had been humbled, so the flesh with the Son must be exalted to this Glory, *Phil. 2. 9, 10.* And the Glory which Christ hath as Mediator, is founded upon Christ's sonship in this respect as Judg, as in all other respects, & indeed in any other respect but as the Son, he is not capable of being Judg; for though whole Christ be Judg, yet the natural right to it, and ability to perform it, is as he is the Son; and that the whole in both Natures is Judg, is of grace. And can any rational man think, that Christ a meer man should be able to judge the secrets of men, if he were not God as wel as man; so that that honor to judg as Mediator, is given to him in flesh, as declarative of that essential Power and Glory which he had as Son with the Father and Spirit from Eternity, that all might honour the Son with the equal honour as the Father is honoured.

And whereas he saith, That the Father is principal in Judgment, and is the *Alpha* and *Omega* of it, alluding to the place where the Father is so called, why should not the Son be principal in Judgment with the Father, being the Alpha and Omega of it, seeing he also is so called in Scripture.

Thus I have followed him in all his Evasions and shifes, and have unmasked his Answers, and plucked off the fair Vizard that he had put upon them, and have discovered the deceit, and

raud, and falsehood that was hid under them. And I have vindicated the rest of the Scriptures that I alledged from his corrupt Interpretations that he put upon them, and have confirmed the Arguments which I produced, and they now abide in their strength, and have removed and taken out of the way that which troubled their Testimony, which they brought to the Godhead of Christ, that they could not be heard, by reason of the noise that his Answers made in mens ears.

Let it be considered from first to last, what a poor, weak, feeble, base, mean, contemptible, despiseable Christ Saviour, Mediator, Intercessor he makes this great God and our Lord Jesus to be; and what a pernicious, defective, lame, and beggerly righteousness and satisfaction he brings unto us for our support and how shamefully and reproachfully he strips him, robs him of the Honour and Glory in all things that is due unto him: The worship which he must have, can but amount to Reverence, which is only due to one, that hath the meer honour to come in the name of another, which is all he grants to Christ; for he denies him to be the ultimate object of worship, and there is no intermediate object of worship which is not founded in the ultimate or last object: and all that come in Gods name, *Moses* and all the Prophets share with him upon that account in this reverence. And he cannot be the object of faith at all, according to him, but a me-
dium

dium or mean by which we come to believe in him who is the object or end ; and such is the written Word of God and all the publishers of it, mediums or means by which we come to believe on God ; and herein Christ is become like one of them. This is an humbling of him with a witness : and he is but an instrumental Saviour whose virtue is in an other according to him, as there have bin many since the beginning of the world, and still are ; the beasts which were sacrificed, and the Priests who sacrificed them, were instrumental saviours ; and now the Gospel, and the Preachers thereof are instrumental saviours, and Gods appointment and assistance (which he saith Christ had) might have made them (as he must needs grant) as effectual as he ; thus he levels Christ & brings him down from his height to be like to other things, which are fellow instruments with him. And so he makes Christ to be a meer mediator by assistance, but impotent in himself ; for faith he, what work soever you can instance in belonging to Christs mediatorship of himself he was not able to perform it, unless by the assistance of another and so he was a compleat Mediator ; and so might *Moses* or any other man be : and thus he is made weak and feeble like one of us, not having the least sufficiency of himself, but a capacity to partake of Gods sufficiency, which also may be predicated of any other person, they may not say they are able to do

do all things that God will call them forth to, through Gods strengthening them; and he makes Christ to be but an instrumental Agent in that righteousness by which believers are justified: an instrumental Agent also in forgiving sins; he doth but act about these things, is not the Author of them: and herein other men have the same privilege. He himself tells us that it is the privilege of some men to forgive all sins in reference to the curse of the Law, and he quotes Job. 20. 23. which is to be understood in a declarative way, and Christ hath no greater honour than this. The satisfaction also of Christ is rather satisfaction of grace, as he presents it, than satisfaction of justice; it is satisfaction without any proportion to the offence. As he lays it down he doth in effect bring in God speaking of it, as the Apostle brings in God speaking of mercy, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy;* and so he, *I will be satisfied with what I will be satisfied with,* whether it be proportionable or not, without respect to justice. And his ability to intercede according to the condition and necessity of the Church, is not from himself nor in himself, but from a communication of power from the Father. And for judging he doth it in an instrumental way, and hath all saints copartners with him in the work, sharing in the like honor, only he is superintendent in it, which belongs rather to order than to power.

After this manner he deals with Christ, who was, and is, and ever will be in the form of God, and equal with God, with him he deals thus ; humbling him abasing him, and making him in all things to be like unto men, proportioning him, and equalling him to others, not by vayling his his glory and majesty, but by denying it ; which is the highest indignity that can be offered to this Lord of glory. And yet (which is not a little to be wondred at, and forrowed for) how many are there who will not understand this, but cry him up for a great advancer of Christ, yea he is made superlative herein ! they say he exalts Christ above all that ever they heard preach him ; but either they declare their gross ignorance, or somthing that is worse. They may low fig-leaves together to cover his nakednes, and hide his shame, but if they be intelligent persons, they must needs know that the substance and truth of divine glory and excellency is plucked off, and torn away from him, and that the shaddow only remaineth ; he hath taken away all glorying from Christ, as the Apostle took it away from saints ; it may be said of Christ, as of others ; *What hast thou oh Christ, which thou hast not received ?* Christ hath received more of Gods grace, and is more indebted to the most high, and that is all he can glory of according to him, for he hath nothing of his own to glory of.

And yet many poor Christians though thus defrauded & cheated of the true Christ, are contented

tented with the Christ which he obtrudeth upon them, and bleis themselves with the knowledge of such a Christ which he hath shaped out, or mishaped rather, who holds no proportion with that which Scripture hath limped out and presented to us ; yet they rejoice and glory in this Christ. O miserable darknes and blindnes (that I say not perversnes) in men,in Christians, that they do not discover how great and dangerous the cheat is! Oh how dangerous is this? If God should not be merciful to them, and open their eys to see the horridnes of it, what would become of them ? Such an impotent weak Christ who could not save himself by any strength in himself, is unlike to save them. And thus far in Answer to him and his book.

Now because I discern that very strange and very unsafe opinions are very rife in this Nation, and very detestable and horrid doctrines are set to sale, and many come (who have been accounted and no question some of them are so) very pretious Christians, and cheapen them, and (because they be fair fruit, some of them) to the ey, they buy them up, and make them their own , they receive them and intertain them, and are very fond of them, they hugg them and imbrace them as precious doctrines, and they lay out their tyme, and parts, and all their talents in the defence of them, and so it comes that as they themselves were deceived by them, they deceive others by them also ; by which

which means they come to grow and spread : I think my self bound to prevent somthing by way of prevention that they may not be so abundantly engendred, and multiplied in conception, or if they be, that they may be abortive, and not brought forth; at least, that the current of them may be stopped, that they may not have such free passage; for it is to be much lamented, that they should spread , prosper , grow, and fill good ground to much, which if they must have a being, are fitter for reprobate ground, which God hath rejected; but this is the hour of temptation, and if ever the Elect be in danger to be deceived, they are now in danger; for there are winds of doctrine which will shake those that are built upon the rock Christ, and will overturn others, whose foundation is but sandy and is not right, let them therefore take heed, for if they fal not now, they may probaby stand fast for ever.

In order therefore to the stifling & strangling, to the consuming and destroying of them, & that saints may be kept and preserved sound and incorrupt in the faith, or at least may be recovered out of errors into which they have fallen, I shall give some few hints of these four particulars.

1. Of the cause of Errors, how they come to spring.
2. Of the growth of Errors, how they come to spread.
3. Of the cure of Errors, what ought to be done to heal the persons of them, and to destroy the Errors in them.
4. Of the preservatives against errors, when they are rife, and not easily cured where they have taken root, and how Christians may be kept untainted and undefiled of them.

1. The

1. The causes of Errors are many, by which
meanes it comes to pass that many are leavened
with them.

1. There are many Apostate Christians who
have put away a good conscience, and concerning
faith they have made shipwrack of it, as the
Apostle speaketh 1 Tim.1.19. and in Gods just
Judgement it comes to pass, many times, that
thele have a Spirit of error let loose upon them ;
and these, as the false Prophets and false Apo-
stles of old, go about as seducers, and deceivers,
and say that they have dreamed, and they have
received a word from the Lord, and they utter
lyes and falsehoods in the name of the Lord ;
these have a dextrous way of insinuation, to in-
gratiate themselves among the people, and to
steale away their hearts from their sound and
powerful Pastors and Teachers, as the false A-
postles bewitched the people, and alienated their
affections from the Apostles of Christ. These
serve not the Lord Jesus (as the Apostle Paul
speaketh Rom.16.17.) but their own bellies and
for filthy lucre sake, make merchandize of the
souls of the poore people.

2. There are many persons of great parts
and gifts, and of unsanctified hearts and spirits;
these are apt to be puffed up with pride, and to
fall into the snare and condemnation of the devil.
1. Tim.3.6. These are ambitious of glory, and
would fall under observation for singularity ;
These are seldom wise to sobriety : these have bin

wont to abound in notions and conceptions, & to be greatly extravagant therein ; and Satan hath commission given unto him to enter into them, & to work effectually in them, and by them, & they become notable instruments in his hands, and he is a lying spirit in their hearts, and tongues, and these have the art and skill of putting off corrupt and adulterate Doctrine, as if it had Gods touch and stamp upon it & by the sharpness and acuteness of the parts and wits of these, simple and more unwary Christians come to be beguiled.

3. Many of the people are weake and injudicious, and have not a good root of knowledge in them, they do not know things in the reas ons and causes of them; but have received the notion of the truth without the ground of it; they have not a deep insight, but a superficiall knowledge onely; and have seen the outside, but know not the mystery within; and so it comes that with every wind of Doctrine they are shaken, Eph. 4.

14. through the flight of men and cunning craf tiness: for it is easy to present things with another face, while persons look not after that which is within, and the fraud and falsehood comes not to be discerned, for the net and the snare is not in sight, and that which is specious is only presented.

4. Many persons are ambitious after knowledge that they may increase it, and are wholly given (as the Athenians to understand news, so they) to understand Doctrine, & to arrive at higher notions and conceptions, not for the honour of God, nor in affection to the truth, but to furnish themselves unto discourse and to increase their repute, and so they become swift in hearing, and quick in receiving, any.

any new Doctrine, and God gives them up to strong delusions that they may believe lies. 2 Thes. 2. 10 &c. who neither seek nor receive the truth in the love of it, that they may be saved, but that they may be praised.

5. Persons that have a real implantation into Christ, and those that have onely a visible and formal implantation, but want a true ingraftment, they live together, not only in the world but in the Church of Christ also, and are under some droppings and waterings of external enjoyments, and have a name to live and yet are truly dead; and the honour and praise of those that are saints indeed are put upon them. Now God that discernes betwixt the sheep and the goats, and seperates betwixt them, and he also who unmasks hypocrites, and plucks the vizard off from them, he that can distinguiih betwixt the natural complexion in his own people, and the paintings of others who pretend to him, but are none of his, he in his providence brings an houre of temptation both upon the one and other, he tries them both with the wind of false Doctrine, and heresie, and for this end he doth it, that they which are approved may be manifest, and that the hypocrisie of the rest may be made detected; that himself may have glory in his own, and that the others may ly under shame. 1 Cor. 11. 19. And the Apostle John saith they went out from us, because they were not of us; which is applicable to false Doctrine, and error, and heresie; they left the truth, and those that adhered to it, and they went out after error.

6 Many persons forsake, or never put themselves in to that order which Christ hath appointed for Saints to walk in, in which they might be watched over, and so kept, by which meanes they are in a state, as sheep without shepheards, and when the Wolfe commeth they become a prey; for the sheep are not able through weakness and simplicite to defend themselves, if there be no shepheard to provide for their safety: and poor weak well meaning Christians are less able; sheep will fly from danger though that doth not save hem alwayes, but Saints many times mistrust no evill, and so decline not the danger.

The Apostle declares how he himself watched for the space of three yeers, with many teares, to prevent this evill of the flock being devoured by Wolves; and he calls the Elders of *Ephesus* together, and gives them this charge, that they would take heed to themselves and to the flock over which the holy Ghost hath made them overseers, to feed the Church of God, that is, with sound incorrupt doctrine; and he renders this reason, because after his decease grievous Wolves should enter in not sparing the flock, and men of perverse minds amongst themselves, Acts 20. 28, 29, 30. And it is to be observed, that such persons, how wise soever, how holy soever they do profess to be, and really may be, who cast off Ordinances and Churches, and Ministry, and say there are now no Pastours, nor Teachers, nor flocks committed to them, as in Primitive times there were, and so withdraw themselves from the vigilancie of such Shepheards, of all Christians they are the most unstable and the most apt to erre and go astray, and the most apt to entertaine strange and unscriptural doctrine; and the reason of this is, not because of the wisdome and righteousnessesse of such persons who are Pastours and Teachers, above all other men, as if they by their prudence and understanding and holinesis were able to preserve those that are committed to them, from evill, but because it is the Ordinance of Christ that Saints should be in fellowships, and should have

Pastors and Teachers as Guides, and Watchmen, and Overseers over them, therefore a blessing goes along with it for the most part ; and those that cast off this Order , are left very much to themselves , and deserted of Christs strength, not being found in Christs way : Yet it is not arrogating to assert that Pastors and Teachers either are, or ought to be the most prudent, and most sober minded, and best tempered, and best settled and stablished, and most firmly rooted and grounded, and each way the most able of the body, to which they do belong. for they are by office as eyes to the rest of the members.

7. Many unite and congregate together without any that are competently furnished with gifts among them to be Pastors and Teachers, neither having any in their eye whom they may call thereto and obtaine ; and being thus in fellowship, they propound the edifying of one another by holding out their conceptions each person to other, both in prophecy and in conference, and in this case much comes to be spoken, and perhaps in some places none able to judge, and he that hath the ripest and accutest parts leads the rest; & if he be not very sober minded, he is sure to lead them into error ; the sad effects of this I have much observed. Now this is more dangerous in these times then it would have been in some other ages, because corrupt doctrine is very rife, and one shall hardly live any where but there will not be provi-

vidences that will cast him into places and meetings where it will be vented, and if any be taken therewith, he will be sure to vent it, if he be not very humble when he is put upon exercise among those he stands thus related to ; and dangerous doctrine comes out in print, and may be read in books which are dispersed abroad, and if persons be not very well able to judge of them , but are deceived with faire pretexts, and if they have not settled, sober, and well established spirits, those doctrines (of all other) will fall most under their observation, and will have the deepest impression, and will be best remembred , and will be the soonest communicated, because of the rarity of them by such persons when they meet with the rest of the body, especially if such persons do affect singularity.

8. Many Pastors and Teachers are men of corrupt judgments and unsound principles , and by reason of the opportunity that such have of venting their Tenents, and the interest that they have in their own flocks and other people to whom they preach, comes to passe that from them Error and Heresie passeth into others that relate to them, and are hearers of them; and from hence it was that formerly, and of old, falsehoods and doctrines of lies dispersed themselves abroad, and filled the land.

9. But now the danger is leſſe in reference to the Ministry, because it is but of little account a-

mong many that pretend to Saintship, amongst whom (I doubt not but that) some of them are truly good, at least comparatively the esteeme is small to what it was. And this proceeds partly from the too much bitterness and fiercenesse which hath been shewed by many Ministers, against such who have in the smallest points dissent-ed from them, by which meanes they have estranged the hearts of such from them, and lost their repute among them. And partly from that self-seeking, and too much affectation of rule, and power, and preheminence which hath been justly ob-served to be in many Ministers, the good of the flock having in the interim been much neglected; but though some are guilty herein, yet all connot be justly charged. And partly because the just liberty of prophesying (which belongs (as I con-ceive) without contradiction, to the people, if it be rightly bounded) hath been denied them by the generality of the Ministers of this Nation, which have cryed out against it; whence it hath come to passe that many precious ones among the people have entertained thoughts, that the Ministers designe hath been to keep them in bond-age, and to advance themselves over them, and so they have broken from them, and have had them in disesteeme. But principally it comes to passe through the practise of some evill workers, who have aspersed the Ministry more then there hath been cause, and have rendred them odious to o-
thers

thers. And now the danger of the springing and spreading of Errors is more in reference unto these, who have withdrawn the affections of the people from the Ministers, and have brought in themselves into favour in stead of them, and are carried with those temptations which they have been wont to charge the Ministry with, affecting singularity and preheminence, and would be thought to know much, and would be accounted Prophets and Teachers, and their designe is to draw away disciples after them; and they affect new notions, and high expressions, which they perceive to be taking with the people, and so a door comes to be opened to Error.

10. There is an exorbitancy in that liberty which Saints have to exercise their gifts in prophecy. All the Brethren that are in a Church are not Prophets, that is, all have not the gift of Prophecy; *1 Cor. 12.29 and chap. 14.1.* But they must be proved first, and approved, before they take upon them to prophesie, and those who are sound and sober should only be allowed. What is spoken of Deacons, *1 Tim. 3.10.* will hold in proportion to others, and hands must not be laid on suddenly, *ver. 12.* A sudden approbation of any to office is not allowed, and there is the same reason for the exercise of gifts. As every one hath received a gift, so let him dispense it; there are private gifts, and there are publick gifts; there are gifts that may edifie a few,

few, and there are gifts that may edifie many ; there are gifts that may edifie weak ones, and there are gifts to edifie strong ones ; there are gifts that may edifie a family, and there are gifts that may edifie a Church ; there are gifts that may edifie a part of the body, and there are gifts that may edifie the whole body ; There may be profit in the exercise of some gifts to some, when there is no honour to Christ before men, that such gifts should be publickly exercised. The Ordinances of God by this liberty, unwarily and unsoberly used, fals under much contempt. Not but that I wish from my very soule that all the Lords people were Prophets, and that all had gifts by which all might edifie and be edified, and Christ glorified in all, who hath given such gists to men ; but till there be such a pou-ring out of the spirit, let none be carried out beyond what he hath received, some have much more need to learn then to teach in an Assembly.

And how can any preach unlesse they be sent, *Rom. 10. 11.* unlesse perions can assume to themselves and make out to others an immediate calling, as the Apostles did. If they be not able to say that their calling to preach is not of men, nor by men, but by Jesus Christ, then there must be an order in the Churches of Christ, and they must fall under it. If they think they have a gift, they must not exercise it because they think

so, but they must be called forth, and their gift
tryed, & the Church must judge. And unlesse this
Christian liberty of exercising gifts be thus boun-
ded, how wil the exorbitancy in the exercise of it
be repressed? Many run upon this work being dri-
ven therto by their lusts, I speak what I know, and
what many with me have had woful experience
of. A flood-gate to error is set open by this
means, and I think truth hath been as much
undermined by this one stratagem of Satan, viz.
The setting up of multiplicity of teachers, as by
any other policy of his, these many ages. The
time was that the Ministry undermined prophecy
in the gifted Saints, but the time is, that prophesie
in those that are (many of them neither gifted nor
called) undermines Ministry. And the peoples spi-
rits are many of them inordinately carried, rather
after prophecy, by the poorest, weakest, and
rarest persons, that will consume time that
way, then after the best gifts that are ministe-
rially exercised among them. I am loth to say
that such who are exercised, and such who put
them upon it, and incourage them in it, do
seek honour one of another, and not that hon-
our so much which is of God: but if I say
that there is some temptation upon their spi-
rits, sure I am, I shall not misse it in reference unto
many, and I charge not all. I am afraid lest
the times become or coming, of which the A-
postle speaks, 2 Tim. 4. 3,4. That sound doctrine

will not be endured, and that men after their lusts, will heap unto them teachers, having itching ears, and that they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned after fables. For the last times are spoken of by *Paul*, and these are the last times; and now there are more teachers then all latter ages have shewed, and Truth hath lesse acceptation among many then Error, at least the Reprovers of error will not be endured, but such ones in many places, and to many persons, makes themselves a prey. And it is most certain, that there is a lusting in persons to partake of every mans gift, though he be a very stranger that is come among them under the profession of a Saint, whose face they never saw before; and there must be some new notion presented, or there will be but slender acceptation expressed. I desire to mourn for these things, of which there hath been very sad experience in the parts where I have lived, and the consequence hath been dreadful and detrimental to faith and holiness.

I have cleared my self from being any enemy to prophecyng, yet lest I should be suspected, I declare it again, that I am not against it, but I look upon it as an ordinance of Christ, if it be rightly regulated, and it is on foot in that fellowship of Saints to which I stand related; those whom we have found competently furnished

with

with the spirit for such an undertaking, we have opened the door to, for an occasional exercising of their parts ; and we have shut it against others whom we have not conceived able ; but I look upon that promiscuous way, licentious liberty of prophesying by any that will put themselves upon it, as unscriptural and justly scandalous to many that are truly good. And I conceive that at this door much error hath entered in among us, for some are weak and erre in holding forth their conceptions ; and some are immodest, and soare up in notions which themselves understand not ; and some are leavened, and are glad of an opportunity to vent such opinions which they have received, and of which they are in travel, till they get a time to vent them and broach them to others.

11. Many receive strangers in among them that have knowledge, and plausible expressions, and seeming Sanctity, without inquiring after them, without assurance of their soundnesse given to them, without any letters of commendation from known approved persons or Churches concerning them, which the Primitive Saints and Churches expected and required, in reference to all strangers that came among them, and it was found a necessary and a safe way for the preservation of the Churches then, 2 Cor. 3. 1, 2. and they are an example therein to us, for otherwise wolves may be entertained instead of the Teachers

ers and Preachers of Christ. The Apostles when they sent messengers to other Churches, speaks of chosen men, and passe a singular commendation upon them, that they might be received and credited: and they speak of others that went out from them, but were not sent, who had troubled them with words and subverted their souls, *Act 15. 24, 25, 26.* There is good doctrine in this history, and it was written for our learning that Saints and Churches may be warned, that they receive not any that are not sent, that are not chosen men and known persons among the Saints, for while they harbour such, and intrust their souls in their hands, they are misled, and in danger to be destroyed.

12. There are many that have been raking in the filthy channel of all the old and horrid errors and heresies of former ages, and have exerted the Scriptures and Arguments, which they have judged most plausible and taking with the people, wherewith such opinions were fortified and enforced, and have held forth as if they had received them through some divine light, that the spirit of God hath imparted to them, and they have been entertained by the people as singular revelations, and rare discoveries of the hidden truths of God, which God hath made known to such who have had secret Communion with him, and so they have been infected and corrupted.

13. Many are grown suspicious of all that they have beleived and received, as if all had been taken up by them upon tradition, and they give out that they must try all things, yea principles themselves, and that they must see with their own eyes, by which it appears that they professe to be established in nothing, rooted and grounded in nothing, and so they lie open to all danger, and are subject to be carried away with every winde of doctrine, for if any come to them in the habit of a Saint, pretending the study of divine mysteries, and be able to out-reason them, or to present as they judge, some unanswerable things to them, such an one becomes prevalent, and draws away such after him.

14. Many conceive that they are fallen into times of great discoveries, and that mysteries that have been hid from ages, are now revealed to the Saints,

Whence it comes to passe, that if any strange doctrine be broached, how horrid an erreur soever it be, provided that plausible grounds be laid down for it, it is presently sucked in and received, with apprehensions that a doctrine that hath layn in darknesse many generations, is now manifested to the Saints; when as in truth and deed the foundation is truly laid already, and hath been truly built upon, else both we our selves & Christians of former ages were very wretched and miserable, and that which Saints shall be height-

heightned in is this, they shall know more perfectly what they knew more darkly, and that which the Saints have doubted of, and have been divided about, they shall understand.

15. The esteem of Saints is now very low among many, unlesse they be able to bring some doctrine which former ages have not known, or to produce some new notion and discourse of some high point, which neither themselves nor others do well understand; and unlesse they be able to speak in a language which the Christians of former ages have not understood, plain Scriptural language will not now satisfie, unlesse there be high strains which sober Christians have not been much acquainted with. This lays a temptation upon many preeious souls, to affect and to seek after novelties, and so they come to be darkned with new errors that arise, and are turned after fables.

The second thing that I propounded to discuse, is the causes of the growth of errors, and how they come to spread.

It is a certain truth, that that which begets them, doth also nourish them, and increase them, and so there must be a looking back to the causes of the springing of them, and the self-same things will be found, the causes of the spreading of them, and of the prospering of them.

Ignorance and pride, and affectation of glory, praise and a corrupt conscience, and unsanctified

Etified parts and gifts, and formal implantations into Christ without reality and power, and forsaking the assembling of our selves together, and aspiring unduly to prophecyng without a calling thereto; and many others that have been mentioned, these have given life to errours, and these have given strength to them also.

But there are some special causes of the growth of errours, divers from such which have been already presented as the rise of them.

1. The censures of the Church are not duly exercised to represele that inordinate lusting after strange doctrine, and that pride, vain glorioussesse, vanity of spirit, and wantonnesse of mind, with which many Saints are too much carried, and are sick of; Not that I would have Saints cast out of the Church, for every difference in judgement from their brethren, or dissenting in opinion; those that have known me, have known that I have been evermore a stranger to such rigidnesse. I would not have so much as the peace of such disturbed in the least kind by any, but if any opinion strike at the foundation, threatening the overturning of it, and be very destructive to the faith and holinesse of Saints, I think there is warrant enough, (and I hope I shall be able to make it out from Scripture) to proceed to the questioning and censuring of such persons, who by other means cannot be reclaim-ed.

ed. And the neglecting of this ordinance of Christ is of evil consequence unto the furthering and ripening of error; for however it may be thought and spoken by some, that Church-censures bring no light to men with them, nor can be effectual for the conviction of persons judgements (which hath truth in it,) yet the distemper of spirit (from which error, when it is grosse, doth as commonly arise as from weaknesse of judgement) and unsobornesse of heart is healed and cured by Church censures.

2. Communion and fellowship with those who are corrupt and unsound in their opinions, is not forborn, but there is the same liberty used of conversing with such, and the same intimacy and familiarity shewed, as with any others how sound soever; when yet the Apostle saith, *Avoid them*, Rom. 16.17. The Psalmist saith, *They were mingled among the Heathen, and learned their works*. The latter followed upon the former, the Apostle saith, *A little leaven leaventh the whole lump*, that is, when it is put to the whole lump, and is with it, but purge it out and it cannot; therefore his council is *To purge out the old leaven*, which though it be spoken of the leaven of ungodliness in persons, is yet applicable to the leaven of heresie and error, which is more infectious and spreading then the other.

Obj.

Obj. But such persons are Saints ; why should their Communion be declined ?

Sol. Why doth God himself withdraw from Saints, and hide his face from them ? is it not to humble them and make them ashamed, and bring them to repentance ? And may not, yea ought not we to withdraw from unsound and corrupt persons (though they should be Saints,) for the same reasons ? especially seeing our own preservation is in it.

Obj. But it will make divisions among Saints to forbear the fellowship of such, and it will rejoice the common adversarie, therefore for the scandal that is in it, such withdrawing must not be allowed.

*Sol. A holding of Communion with such, will at last cause division, and not a withdrawing from them, for such who bring any other doctrine by conversing with Saints, do get a Party, and so make division. The Apostle declares whence division proceeds, Rom. 16. 17. not from those who shun Communion with leavened persons, but from such who are corrupt and leavened, *Mark those (saith he) who cause divisions contrary to the doctrine that ye have received ;* Such persons who bring unscriptural doctrine cause the divisions, for by their crafty insinuations they deceive the simple, and draw away disciples, and this engenders a rent, for the rest must oppose and resist, unless they also will become disciples ;*

ciples; and if they do appear for the truth, against the error the rest are carried away with, then there will be division following upon it.

As for the glorying of the common adversary, there is more occasion given him to glory at that union that is betwixt hereticks and erroneous persons, and such who profess to be Saints; and the scandal is greater, because the Adversary will give it out they are all corrupt, they are unsound, they are all hereticks, all erroneous corrupt persons, for they mix together, and at least there is an allowance; this is justly more scandalous then the other, nay the other is not scandalous at all; but it is the glory of the Saints in the presence of their enemies, to keep themselves from all corrupt things and persons, what profession soever they make.

3. There is a tampering with opinions that are unsound, and with persons also who are corrupt, by which means it comes to passe that many lay themselves under strong temptations, and through the righteous hand of the Lord they come to be left to error, and become as corrupt as any. There are some, and not a few, that take great delight to talk with all kind of persons, who hold any strange opinion, as bring any new doctrine, and if there be any book into which any poyson of corrupt doctrine is instilled, they will use all means to get such a book, and will choose rather to read therein then in any

any other, till at length they be changed into the same image, and be principled alike to the persons and books they are so conversant with. Now this evil proceeds;

1. From an opinion that some hold, that it is the duty of Christians to try all things, and to keep that which is good ; but the commandment of the Apostle is mistaken ; for first, this trying respects all the doctrines and spirits of men that we are called necessary to partake of, and be conversant in ; so the doctrines of our own Pastors and Teachers must be tryed, and of others also, whom providence leads us to hear, and it respects the knowledge of doctrines whereto we have not yet attained ; but we are not by virtue of this commandment, to rake into all opinions that are or have been among Apostate Christians ; nor is it a duty to be always trying, but we must be rooted, and grounded, and established as we have been taught. And this is a commandment of the Apostle, whereto we ought to attend ; and we must leave the principles, and passe on to perfection, that is, having laid them in the foundation, we must build higher and higher upon them, till we come to a perfect man in Christ.

2. From a presumption which persons have of their own strength, they think there is no danger, but that they shall be able well enough to discover the evill in any opinion, and not be hurt by it, and in the interim they may read or hear some-

thing that may edifie them. But indeed the most of these are unacquainted with their own weaknesse, and they know not the depth of Satan till they fall by them.

3. From some decay of appetite, so farre as concernes feeding upon wholsome nourishing truths, for it is a symptome of a weak distempered stomack, that it would behold variety of meats, but it cannot feed upon any; so when the soule is carried out to curiosity, to be looking and prying in all things, that any are carried to, it is to be feared, that it feeds upon nothing which may build it up and strengthen it.

4. Error comes to be spread by the temerity, invigilancy, insobriety, & imprudence of many Christians; some are sudden in entertaining of opinions, & not sober; some are close and secret in their search and enquiry after them, and never discover any thing till they be formed within them, and till themselves come to be formed into the similitude of them, and then it becomes an hard work to destroy that which is so firmly received; and some over-match themselves, while they oppose their understanding parts and abilities to the intellect and sharpnesse of apprehension, and dextrousnesse of wit, and valtnesse of parts, and strength of braine, that false Teachers and Seducers have; by which means it comes to passe that they are easily overcome, and advantage is given to the erroneous to propagate their corrupt opinions;

nions; Whereas there ought to be great deliberation, much consultation, open heartednesse also in persons to their owne Pastors and Overseers, or dear friends whom they may confide in, and a calling out for help where it is most like to be afforded, that such doctrines may be debated upon equall terms, before they be received.

5. The countenance and encouragement that is given to persons that bring unsound and unscripturall doctrine; and the applauses and praises wherewith they are followed by some high ones, and holy ones, (it may be for some parts that are eminent in them, and for some dresse of holinesse that they appear in) do give life and strength to such doctrines; for when great ones and godly ones are become admirers and adorers of such persons, and harbour them, and honour them, the eyes of others are thereby turned after them; and there will be many that in a moment will be found to strengthen the hands of such evill workers and seducers that do traverse the land, and to strengthen their errors also.

6. If it once come to passe that any eminent ones in office, interest, abilities, graces, upon whom the eyes of many people are, and who are leading persons in the places where they live, and after whose example many go; if any such be left of God to strange doctrine, they will draw away many disciples after them, and the land will in a short time be filled with error, if there be not

some merciful providences to prevent the diffus-
ion of it. And when it begins to take hold of
Saints, it is most likely to strike alle, for then there
is none other putt upon it, while it lodgeth in such sub-
jects, whiche temperautes and self-seeking persons
(which were men of carnall and low principles)
harboured it; it was of base repaire and prospered
not; But gets a better name by getting into heads
and hearts of believers.

The third thing that comes to be discoursed is
the meanees of cure how persons may come to be
healed of errors, and errors may come to be de-
stroyed in them.

¶ There must be an encountering with such er-
rors as doctrines, and they must be brought to
scriptural tryall, and there they must be arraigned,
and thence they must be condemned. The
reason is, because they are presented with the pre-
text of scripture, scripture is made use of to fisher
them in, else they could get no entrance; therefore
Scripture must throw them out again; And
Seducers mouthes will not be stopped any other
way, nor will their followers be deceived any
other way; Therefore there is a necessity that
the truth should be held out, and strongly forti-
fied with scripture and with argument, by which
the mind may be filled with light, and that error
should be confuted, and the nakednesse and for-
gidenesse thereof detected, that those that are in-
genuous may come to be ashamed, that have ad-
heard

beared to it, and may learn to abhorre it, *1 Cor.*
1. 9, 10. An Elder or Bishop must be able by
sound doctrine to convince gain-sayers, for there
are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers,
whose mouths must be stopped, &c. This place is
worthy of observation, for if shewes what ought
to be done in these times. And look how many
wayes error hath been propagated, such wayes
should be taken for the spreading of truth. The
contrary truths to the grand errors of this age
ought to be held out in words that cannot be cog-
demned by preaching, printing, letters written,
private communication and suggestion by open
conferences also and disputes, and happy are those
that have gifts and hearts so contribute any thing
this way. See we the sedulity and industry of Paul
this way, *Acts 20. 31.* for the space of three yeeres
I ceased not (said he) to warne every one of you
night and day with tears.

2. The care and vigilancy of the Churches of
Christ, and of the Officers and Overseers there-
of, must be shewed towards their own mem-
bers, which relate to them, for the healing of
any that have been shaken, or have departed
from the faith; for, for that end are they asso-
ciated together, that they might watch over
one another; and the Elders are principally
called forth to this work, *Acts 20. 31.* Therefore
watch; why, what is the matter? and he tells
us, because grievous wolves shall enter in among

you, not sparing the flock ; and of your selves men shall arise, speaking perverse things, drawing away disciples after them, therefore watch. And in order to a Churches discharging of its duty this way, it is necessary in these times, wherein the members of Churches are scattered abroad through many Provinces, and wherein error is very prevalent, for the Churches of Christ, and the watchmen thereof.

1. To send to all such, (who are at distance from them, and live in dangerous places) to know their faith, least they should be tempted, *1 Thes. 3. 5.* which place, though it may respect the grace of faith, which through affliction may be shaken, yet it will hold in proportion in reference to the doctrine of faith. And though the Apostle declareth what he did, yet therein he is a pattern what those that have a flock committed to them ought to do ; for without doubt what power the Apostles had for edification, and not for destruction, over all the Churches and Members thereof, the same hath each Church, and the Officers thereof, over those that stand related to them. And such who so belong to such Churches, and have such Overseers, are bound to render an account in a Christian way, it is a duty by the Apostle Peters Precept, but much rather is there an obligation where there is such a relation.

2. It is necessary for the Churches to put this burden upon such members of theirs, where such dan-

danger is of seducers, (if they will count it a burden) to abstain from the fellowship of such persons who are not found in doctrines among them, because the Apostle requires it, *Rom* 16. 17. ·² *John* 7. 8, 9, 10. and because there is a double benefit in it. 1. To such which erre so dangerously, they may come to be awakened and afterward ashamed. 2. To those that shun them, and decline them, they come to be kept thereby, and preserved from their error. 3. It is the duty of the Church and watchmen thereof, to withstand such who are false teachers, and who deceive those of their flock by their lies, as *Paul* resisted *Elimas*, who would turn away the Deputy from the faith, and as the shepheard is bound to chase away the wolfe for the safety of the flock. 4. The Church and Elders thereof ought to be warning such of theirs that are in danger, that is, to be presenting them with the evil and danger of such doctrine, and shewing them the horrid effects and consequences which will follow upon it, as in *Acts* 20. 31. Remember how I warned you, and in 1 *Cor.* 15. he shews the evil consequences of denying the Resurrection, which they saw not, but made light of it, but the Apostle had looked into it, & did faithfully hold it forth to them. 5. The Church of Christ and the Rulers thereof ought to reject and cast out such among theirs who are heady and high, and are not reclaimed from such errors

which they have sucked in from such seducers, which have been among them, after they have clearly held out the truth, and detected the contrary error, and confuted it; and after they have admonished and warned such, once, or twice, or thrice, or while there is hope. It is cleat from the Apostles example, in delivering up *Hymeneus* for no other fault but for denying the Resurrection, and troubling others with that doctrine. And also from the Apostles direction given to *Titus*, Tit. 3. 10, 11. *An heretick after once or twice admonition reject, &c.* And indeed avoiding such, and not receiving such, nor saying Gods speed to such, is an high censure, little below that of delivering up to Satan.

Obj. But the question may be, what edification there can be in passing such a sentence upon one that erres in doctrine, either to him that is so censured, or to others.

Sol. Grosse errors or heresies are not fallen into, especially not persisted in (after a cleare light held out) through simple ignorance, but through some distemper of the Will, and some temptation upon the spirit. Now though the censure of the Church hath no aptitude in it to give light where it was wanting to open their eyes, to rectifie an erring judgement, to convince the conscience, or satisfie doubts and scruples, which did arise through simple ignorance, yet the censure of the Church may be a means to heal the will

will, and to remove the temptation from the spirit, what ever it be which may obstruct the right exercise of that light, and understanding which such persons have; and first the censure of the Church may occasion a more serious and deep searching into the truth, or falsehood of doctrines, and may cure that precipitancy and headinesse, and rashnesse, in entertaining and ingaging in doctrines that are not sound and scriptural. There is a vanity of spirit, which lusteth after new opinions, which causeth such facilenes in receiving, that doctrines are no sooner presented, but they are takeu up, but Church-proceedings may be a means to bring on sobriety.

2. That partiality which is in persons in reference unto those whom they respect and affect, may come to be healed, for nothing is more frequent then to hold opinions and tenents, with respect to persons, but this distemper is many times best cured, through the execution of Church power

3. If the truth be departed from for advantage sake, that persons thereby may rise up to greater honour or preferment, Church discipline gives a check many times to such lusts of the flesh, that they cannot prevale with that strength as before they did; when the love of them carried persons to corrupt ingagements that way.

4. Persons are ingaged to that opinion which they have turned aside to, least they should be accounted fickle and wavering, when yet they want

want Scripture-strength to maintain them; but this perversenes and obstinacy is best cured by the admonitions and withdrawings of the Church from such persons. 5. And if there should be any darknesse in the judgement, in reference to plain and clear doctrines, where such darknesse was not before; it is argument to me that God hath justly put out their eyes, in reference to something that hath displeased him, and till they have been ashamed, and have shewed repentance, God will not dispel nor scatter the clouds, nor clear up their judgements; Now Churh adimonition is the best expedient to bring them to repentance, as the Apostle speaks of *Hymeneus*, *I have delivered him up to Satan* (saith he) *that he may learne not to blaspheme*, that is, by denying a doctrine which he ought to have professed. And so such scales of ignorance which were by sin contracted, are by Church-censure removed many times.

Obj. But what if such persons be very holy in their lives, and very profitable in their Communion, must they notwithstanding undergo the censure of the Church.

Sol. I. There is no holinesse but what flows from the doctrine of the Gospel, rightly entertained and held by faith. Therefore so long as they waver in the faith in points of great concernment and moment, their holiness must of necessity be waved also; the Apostle saith, *Gal. 1.*

7,8. *Though I or an Angel from heaven bring any other Gospel* (and yet he means it of circumcision held by some as necessary to salvation) *let him be accursed.* 2. Such persons that are pertinacious in a corrupt opinion, are evil leaven, and their Communion cannot be so profitable, as it is like to be hurtful to the fellowship to which they do belong. 3. If they be Saints which do so greatly erre from the faith, there ought to be so much the more compassion shewed to them, and the greatest love and compassion that can be shewed lies in this, to use the last remedy to them, when other remedies fail, and are ineffectual; and it is the greatest cruelty to withhold any means which God hath sanctified for the healing of such, as from *Exod. 23.ap.*
pears.

5. What one Church of Jesus Christ doth this way in the execution of censure, justly and according to rule, all the Churches ought to ratifie; for if such who are bound by any Church on earth, be bound also in heaven, then all the Churches in the world have not power to acquit or lose from it; therefore in their walking towards such persons (great or small) they ought to confirme it, by having no Communion nor fellowship with such, that so such persons may come to see the miserable condition that they are in, and may be ashamed; and if any Churches or Christians should walk otherwise, they sin against Christ's

Christ's ordinance, and harden such persons in their sin, and hinder their repentance, and returning to the truth, and will draw the blood of such souls upon their heads.

If this course were held with such who erre grossly, and will not be healed, it wold awaken those who have left their first faith, and are turned after fables, and might recover them, and would bring a trembling upon the rest, that stand firme and unshaken, and might preserve them from the like temptations, and then there would be no cause for the interposing of the Magistrate, which some do relish so evilly.

The fourth and last thing that I am to discussse is, what the preservatives are by which persons may be kept, in times in which errours are rife, and the danger great in that respect.

1. Let every person that pretends to saintship look to his implantation into Christ, that it be right and true, and that it be firme and sure, and then it is to be hoped that he will abide in the Vine, and the Vine in him, and then he is more likely to stand fast in the faith, for there is one that is able to keep him from falling, and will keep him, and if he fall he shall rise againe ; for there is one that is able to raire him, and will raise him ; The greatest security of the Saints, that they shall not depart from the faith, is in their union and communion with Christ.

2. Let persons commit themselves to God, to be kept

kept by him, who can strengthen and settle, and establish those that rest on him, and wait for him; while persons have leaned to their ownunderstanding, and have not looked up to the rock that is higher then they, and come out of themselves, and put their trust in him, and begged his teaching and leading, they have become vain in their thoughts, and have erred from the truth.

3. Let persons get a good root of knowledge within themselves, and not attain onely to a generall knowledge of things, but come up to a particular knowledge of them, and know all things in the causes thereof, so farre as Scripture gives light; or as they have been taught; for then, though some other thing may be presented to them, then what they have received, yet the reasons of the things which they have beleaved, will not be so soon answered in their souls. If persons have but a forme of knowledge within them, it is soon overthrown.

4. Let the love of the truth be laboured after, as well as the knowledge of it, for persons will be unwilling to relinquish that truth which they have found much sweetnesse in.

5. Let the Scriptures be diligently searched into, and perused, and studied, and let them be compared together, and let Scripture interpret it selfe, and let one Scripture give the sense of another Scripture, When persons take up some one or two single scriptures, and runne away with them, with

without comparing them with other Scriptures, they are led aside to error.

6. Christians ought to take heed whom they hear, what they hear, and how they hear, because of many Seducers and Deceivers, that are gone abroad into the world, and because there are many spirits of Antichrist, who yet pretend to Christ.

7. Christians ought to become wise unto sobriety, *and not to think of themselves above what is meet*, but to have humble and low thoughts of themselves, for if once Christians be lifted up, they readily fall in this snare of the Devill, which is Error and Heresie.

8. Christians ought to walk up to that light of truth that they have attained to, because there is a promise belonging to such who will live in and practise the truths which they know, *John 7.17.*

9. Saints ought to consider that they have no more of the grace of faith, then they hold of the doctrin of faith, for they therfore beleieve because they have such a word of God to ground their belief upon; if then they hold not that Word, their belief will fall with it, and then must needs be shaken, as much in the grace of faith, as they are in the ground of faith.

10. Let them consider that there is no godliness but what grows out of the Gospel, and springs from the truths of it, if therefore the doctrine of grace in Christ be once overturned in the soule, all godliness will be soon overturned with it, *1 Tim. 6.3. Tit. 1.1.*

11. Let

11. Let them consider that if once they become unstable in the faith, they become unstable in all their wayes, for it is as when a tree is not firmly & deeply and surely rooted in the earth, but is loose in the ground, it growes not, flourisheth not, nor is fruitful like to other trees; therfore faith Christ, *unlesse you abide in me, that is , firmly and surely hold me, ye cannot bring forth fruit.*

12. Let all Christians take heed how they hold the truth in unrighteousnesse, how they put away a good conscience in any thing and so tempt God, leſt God give them up to darknesse , as a punishment of such an offence.

13. Let every Christian joyn to some Church of Jesus Christ that walks closely with God in the truth, that by the watchings of others he may be the better kept. This is regular walking and God will be ſure to bleſſe it.

4 Let not any Christians run into temptations, leſt God ſhould leave them under the power of them, and ſuffer them to be overcome of them ; but if they hear or read a doctrine that is contrary to what they received, let them with much fear and trembling hear and read it ; and with much looking up to heaven for guidance; & let them be ſlow in entertaining that which is new & ſtrange to them; and after much examination & conſultation, and abundant confirmation out of Scripture, let them do it. If Saints will walk in this way, the God of truth and grace will be with them,& they ſhall be kept unto ſalvation,

F I N I S.



A T A B L E of the Scriptures and Arguments formerly pro- duced to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ, and now vindicated and con- firmed in the later Treatise.

ALSO,

Six other Arguments added, shew-
ing the dangerousness and destructive-
ness of the contrary Doctrine.

The first Scripture is *Revel. 1.8.*

*I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning
and the End.* page 15

The second Scripture is *Joh. 1.1.*

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word
was with God, and the Word was God.* p.29

The third Scripture is *Matth. 28.20.*

*Lo, I am with you always, unto the end of the
world.* p.35

The fourth Scripture is *Rev. 2.2.*

I know thy works, &c. p.51

The fifth Scripture is *Col. 1.15.*

The first-born of every creature. p.61
E e The

The TABLE.

The sixth Scripture is Col. i. 16.

By him were all things created.

p.63

The seventh Scripture is Heb. 7.3.

Without father, without mother, without beginning of days and end of life, made like unto the Son of God.

p.90

The eighth Scripture is Prov. 8.22.

The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old : I was set up from everlasting.

p.94

The ninth Scripture is Zech. i 3.7.

Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, against the man that is my fellow.

p.97

The tenth Scripture is Joh. 3.13.

No man hath ascended up into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of man that is in heaven.

p.103

The last Scripture is Joh. 17.5.

And now, O Father, glorifie me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

p.114

Arguments brought to prove the destructiveness of the contrary Doctrine.

Arg. 1. To make whole Christ a creature, brings in a strange and a false God.

p.126

Arg.

The TABLE.

Arg. 2. To make whole Christ a creature, brings
in a strange and false Christ. p. 137

Arg. 3. To make whole Christ a creature, brings
in a false Faith. p. 149

Arg. 4. To make whole Christ a creature, brings
in a false Baptism. p. 158

Arg. 5. To make whole Christ a creature, destroys
the sufficiency of Christ as a Saviour. p. 163

Arg. 6. To make whole Christ a creature, over-
turns godliness. p. 168

Arguments formerly produced, now vindicated and confirmed.

Argum. 1. To make whole Christ a creature, is
to make a meer creature the object of Divine
worship; which yet, according to Scripture, is
Idolatry. Where the doctrine of Worship is
discussed. p. 173

Arg. 2 & 3. To make whole Christ a creature is to
make a creature the object of faith and to make
faith in a creature saving; which yet is con-
trary to the Scripture. p. 205

Arg. 4. To make whole Christ a creature, is to
make a creature a sufficient Saviour; which yet
is repugnant to the Scripture. 214

Arg. 5. To make whole Christ a creature, is to
make a meer creature Mediator; which is con-
trary

The TABLE:

trary to the Scripture. Where the doctrine of Christ's Mediatorship is discussed. p.225

Arg. 6. To make whole Christ a creature, is to make the righteousness not of God, but of a mere man, to be imputed to believers; which is against the Scripture. p.252

Arg. 7. To make whole Christ a creature, is to make a mere creature authoritatively able from himself to forgive sin; which yet is contrary to the Scripture. p.262

Arg.8. To make whole Christ a creature, is to destroy the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction to God. Where the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction is largely handled. p.285

Arg.9. To make whole Christ a creature, destroys the intercession of Christ. p.363

Arg.10. To make whole Christ a creature, is to disable Christ to protect, defend, save, direct, rule and govern his Church in all the world; which yet is attributed to Christ, &c. p.373

Arg.11. To make whole Christ a creature, is to make prayer to him vain and frivolous, he being now in heaven, and we on earth. p.377

Arg.12. To make whole Christ a creature, is to make a mere creature the Judge of the world; which is repugnant to Scripture. p.384

Concerning Errors: the rise, growth, cure, and preservatives against them. p.397

FINIS.

a
s
3
o
e
b
3
to
g
7
to
d;
34
nd
97